

UNIVERSITY OF ST. MICHAEL'S COLLEGE



3 1761 066969197

MEN & WOMEN  
OF THE  
*English*  
*Reformation*





115  
19

THE MEN AND WOMEN

OF

**The English Reformation,**

FROM THE

*DAY'S OF WOLSEY TO THE DEATH OF CRANMER.*

PAPAL AND ANTI-PAPAL NOTABLES.

BY S. H. BURKE,

AUTHOR OF "THE MONASTIC HOUSES OF ENGLAND."

*"Time Unveils all Truth."*

VOL. II.



London:

R. WASHBOURNE, 18, PATERNOSTER ROW

1871.

LONDON :  
R. WASHBOURNE, PRINTER,  
18, PATERNOSTER ROW.



## CONTENTS.

	PAGE
Lord Chancellor Andley . . . . .	3
Cromwell and Cranmer on Theology . . . . .	10
The Six Acts.—Dr. Cranmer's Domestic Difficulty . . . . .	17
Cranmer on Confession . . . . .	25
The Religious Institutions of Olden England . . . . .	29
Mediaeval Nunneries . . . . .	45
The Abbey of Glastonbury . . . . .	56
Burnet as an Historian . . . . .	69
Anne of Cleves . . . . .	74
Minor Notabilities . . . . .	81
Archbishop Cranmer . . . . .	88
Catherine Howard . . . . .	89
Thomas Cromwell, the Grand Inquisitor . . . . .	96
What were Cromwell's Religious Sentiments . . . . .	114
Effects of the Confiscation on the People . . . . .	122
The Countess of Salisbury . . . . .	130
Lady Latymore . . . . .	137
The Church and the Holy Scriptures . . . . .	138
Charles Brandon, Duke of Suffolk . . . . .	154
The Convocation and the King . . . . .	160
Henry the Eighth's Spiritual Kingdom . . . . .	166
The Death of Henry the Eighth . . . . .	173
Somerset, the Great Lay Reformer . . . . .	178
Cranmer's Policy in the Reign of Edward VI. . . . .	204
The Seymour Scandal . . . . .	217
Somerset and his Brother . . . . .	225
The Three Chancellors . . . . .	233

	PAGE
The Fall of Somerset . . . . .	247
The Duchess of Somerset . . . . .	253
Clerical Reformers . . . . .	255
John Hooper . . . . .	263
John Bale, Bishop of Ossory . . . . .	270
William Barlow, Bishop of St. David's . . . . .	272
Robert Holgate, Archbishop of York . . . . .	275
The Reformers and the Ritualists Contrasted . . . . .	283
The Reformers and the Fasts . . . . .	285
Cranmer's Last Act of Statesmanship . . . . .	288
Death of Edward VI. . . . .	292
State of Parties . . . . .	294
Mr. Froude's Opinion of the Results of the Reformation . . . . .	300
Northumberland's Treason . . . . .	301
Scene on the Scaffold . . . . .	311
Papal and Anti-Papal Notables . . . . .	318
“Dark Pembroke” . . . . .	324
Cuthbert Tonstall, Bishop of Durham . . . . .	327
The Duke of Norfolk . . . . .	336
Queen Mary and her Parliament . . . . .	345
The Reformation in Ireland . . . . .	349
The Irish Dominicans . . . . .	353
The Royal Sisters . . . . .	358
Wyatt's Rebellion . . . . .	370
Lady Jane Dudley . . . . .	373
Lady Jane and Roger Ascham . . . . .	378
A Scene on the Scaffold . . . . .	384
The Duke of Suffolk . . . . .	385
The Queen's Marriage . . . . .	387
Philip's Personal Appearance . . . . .	388
The Banquet Hall . . . . .	391
Character of Philip . . . . .	392
Cardinal Pole . . . . .	392
The Stake and the Rack . . . . .	395
Stephen Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester . . . . .	399
Trial of Archbishop Cranmer . . . . .	401
The Archbishop sent to the Stake . . . . .	404

# The Men and Women of the English Reformation.

---

LORD CHANCELLOR AUDLEY.

LORD CAMPBELL says that Thomas Audley has not much attracted the notice of historians: perhaps from party or sectarian motives he has been ignored. He was undoubtedly, at best, the creature of Thomas Cromwell, Cranmer, and the other concealed Reformers of Henry's reign. He aided in the monastic confiscation, and shared Cranmer's notions of the spiritual headship; professed the same religion as the King and the Boleyns; and promoted the Reformation by indirect means, whilst, like the Seymours, he participated in the Sacrament at the same Catholic altar with the King. The belief of such a man would be difficult to define: perhaps a total negation of creed would be the nearest approximation to the truth. He became the successor of Sir Thomas More as Lord Chancellor of England. There was, indeed, a striking contrast, in almost every

respect, between the two men—the successor of a lawyer so distinguished for genius, learning, patriotism, and integrity, having only commonplace abilities, sufficient, with cunning and shrewdness, to raise their possessor in the world; having no acquired knowledge beyond what was professional and official; having first recommended himself to promotion by defending, in the House of Commons, the abuses of the royal prerogative, and, for the sake of remaining in office, being ever willing to submit to any degradation, and to join in the commission of any crime. He held the Great Seal for a period of twelve years, during which, to please the humours of his master, he sanctioned, as Lord Chancellor, the divorces of that master's three wives—the execution of two of them—the judicial murders of Sir Thomas More, Bishop Fisher, and many others, who, animated by their example, preferred death to violation of conscience and dishonour; the spoliation of the Church, and a large division of the plunder amongst those who planned that dire robbery of the poor; and participated in all those capricious mutations which, amongst other things, presented the wicked absurdity of a profligate layman setting aside the Redeemer by constituting himself head of the Church; and other changes which condemned to death, or prison, those who denied transubstantiation, as well as those who refused to acknowledge the King's supremacy.

In the twelfth year of Henry VIII. Maister Audley was created a serjeant-at-law, and soon perceived that although to mingle in the politics of the times was accompanied by peril, it opened the quickest road to influence. In 1523 he entered the House of Commons, where Sir Thomas More was then Speaker, and gained

much popularity by maintaining the privileges of the Commons, and resisting the frequent demands made by Wolsey for fresh subsidies. He soon, however, perceived that the popular side was not the winning one. He therefore at once retraced his steps, took part with the Court, and pronounced eulogies on Cardinal Wolsey, declaring that those who “opposed the subsidies were disloyal,” and at other times styled them “heretics.” This loyal and “good Catholic” soon received promotion. During the interval of six years, when no Parliament sat, Maister Audley aided and abetted the Court in all its schemes for raising money and oppressing the people. Deep discontent arose, and many of Audley’s financial suggestions were reluctantly abandoned. “Against such a monarch as Henry,” observes Lord Campbell, “and with such tools as Audley, the only remedy for public wrong was resistance.” But, with the feelings entertained by so many as to the King’s omnipotence, resistance was in vain. When the question of the divorce with Katherine of Arragon was raised, Audley at once entered into the King’s views, and when he subsequently saw Wolsey withdraw from the contest, he began to aspire to the Chancellorship. Here, however, he was baffled—but for a while; a man of his character was not altogether necessary at that period, and it was considered more prudent to appoint Sir Thomas More to the office. In 1529 Audley was appointed Speaker of the Commons. In the King’s design to break off relations with Rome he was warmly supported by the new Speaker. Henry was delighted at the manner in which Sir Thomas Audley managed affairs in the Commons. The venal and the timid were alike secured. The con-

vents and monasteries beheld in Audley a formidable enemy, and they accordingly sent him many presents of game, "some jewellery," and letters "full of praise." Throughout these transactions he was thoroughly mean and dishonest.

When Sir Thomas More resigned the Great Seal in 1532, Sir Thomas Audley reached the height of his ambition. Lord Campbell says, "Henceforth, till his death in 1544, Lord Chancellor Audley promoted and presided over the iniquitous measures brought forward in the House of Lords, and was the chief agent in the homicides committed by the instrumentality of legal process." Lord Audley has won deserved infamy for the part he took in the impeachment and trial of More and Fisher. When even Cromwell felt ashamed to prosecute those illustrious men, Audley chided him for what he styled his "love of sentiment," displayed in himself the most cold-blooded frankness, and disdained to hide his deadly purpose, like Cromwell, or profess hypocritical friendship, like Cranmer.

The measures for the suppression of the monastic houses; the selection of the inquisitors; the particular reports which were to be presented to the King of the immorality of the convents, were all arranged in legal form for Cromwell by the Chancellor: the bills for the "separation from Rome," and the punishment of those who dissented from the King on religious subjects, also emanated from Audley. Like Cromwell, he "struck terror into all Churchmen;" bishops and abbots became silent, absent, or subservient; the Reformers hated yet courted him; he avowed admiration for their religious views, yet sent them to the stake as heretics. Having used illegal and disreputable means to promote

the divorce between Henry and Katherine of Arragon, and raising Anna Boleyn to the throne, he next joined Cromwell and his party to bring about Anna's ruin. As Chancellor, he took a leading part in the accusations and trial of Anna. He investigated the case, declaring that the witnesses were all "trustworthy persons." The mode of arresting the unhappy lady was of his arrangement, the commissioners who tried her were selected by him, and he was the presiding judge himself. "He acted," writes a spectator, "more like a brute to the poor Queen than a merciful judge." He next joined Cranmer in her divorce, declaring that she "had never been the King's lawful wife—that the marriage was null and void;" yet he sent her to the scaffold for "adultery committed as the wife of King Henry." This transaction alone is sufficient to consign the memory of Audley and Cranmer to eternal disgrace. Lord Campbell, in reviewing the conduct of those ministers to Anna Boleyn at this time, observes, "It is well that Henry did not direct that Audley should officiate as executioner, with Cranmer as his assistant; for they probably would have obeyed sooner than give up the Seals or the Primacy."

The Bill for "bastardizing" Mary and Elizabeth was another measure brought forward by Chancellor Audley. It was declared by this Act that "whosoever styled Mary or Elizabeth as the King's daughters were guilty of high treason." Lord Audley was not yet done with trials and executions. He presided as Lord High Chancellor at the trial of Courtenay, Marquis of Exeter, and Lord de la Pole Montague, whom the King "disliked because they were his cousins." The charges against these noblemen were frivolous: "they corre-

sponded with another relative, Reginald Pole.” As a matter of course, Audley procured a conviction, and they died on the scaffold. About this time the “jealous-minded Chancellor” felt that his share of the monastic property fell short of that bestowed on some of his colleagues; he therefore writes to Cromwell and the King on the subject. His letters are perhaps the most despicable epistles that were ever written by any man in any prominent office<sup>1</sup>. In one passage he urges his claims in these words:—“I have in this world sustained great damage *and infamy* in serving the King’s Highness, *which this grant shall recompense.*” The King and Lord Cromwell complied with his request; and he was “ordered to put the Great Seal to the grant of the manors he desired.” He “wanted more”—a rich sinecure followed; then the Order of the Garter. On the passing of the Six Acts he was vehement against the Reformers; he entered into all the King’s alleged scruples; he denounced the claims of the Pope to-day, and the Reformers to-morrow. On the occasion of the King’s marriage with Ann of Cleves he was guided by his usual cunning; and when his “beloved friend” Lord Cromwell was impeached, he was foremost for his condemnation. His conduct to the aged Countess of Salisbury was most cruel and vindictive. He gave Cranmer the “benefit of his legal advice” in dissolving the marriage of Ann of Cleves. He next promoted the marriage of Katherine Howard—he would have “no more heretic Queens,” Katherine was a “good Catholic.” He flattered the King on the “beauty of his little Queen,” to which Henry replied,

<sup>1</sup> See “Letters on Suppression of Monasteries,” by the Camden Society, p. 245; also Dugdale, Stephens, and Thorndale.

“She is a little darling ; I love her !” But in a short time Audley secretly joined Cranmer’s party again : the Howards became too powerful for the Reformers ; he feared the “cause of the Gospel would suffer”—which meant that the *recent confiscations might be retaken or reconsidered*. Cranmer having disclosed to him the suspicions he entertained of the inconstancy of Katherine, the virtuous Chancellor was outwardly horrified, but inwardly delighted. The investigation and impeachment of the Queen were brief : Katherine Howard and “all concerned in the accusation perished on the scaffold three days later.” Audley and Cranmer had soon again important business on hand, being now zealously engaged in arranging the King’s sixth marriage with Catherine Parr, whose Protestantism was “very gratifying” both to the Lord Chancellor and the Archbishop of Canterbury. A Bill to “regulate the succession” and define the supremacy of the King in spiritual matters was among the final public acts of Lord Audley<sup>2</sup>.

Amongst the numerous grants and favours conferred by the King upon Audley was that of the Charter House, the property of the celebrated order of Carthusians. The establishment was founded in 1349 by Sir Walter de Manny, a chivalrous knight in the train of Edward III. in his French wars. At the time of the Reformation the Charter House property was valued at 736*l.* per annum—equal to about 15,000*l.* of our present money. Christ Church, within Aldgate, founded by the Empress Maud in 1108, was also conferred upon Audley.

Of his last days little is known but that he died after

<sup>2</sup> Lord Campbell’s “English Chancellors,” vol. i.

a protracted illness, which he is said to have borne with fortitude and resignation. It is alleged that “a Benedictine friar attended the quondam Reformer daily during his last sickness ; he dictated letters to several persons whom he had formerly injured, ordered alms to be dispensed amongst numerous indigent, and masses to be sung for his soul’s health.” These statements are very doubtful : it is far more probable that his end was like his wicked life, and that he passed away in final impenitence. It has been said that the best apology for Wolsey is the contrast between the maturity and the later years of his life. Lord Audley’s most severe condemnation must be a review of those crimes persisted in during his entire term of power, of which crimes and injustices, if he did not deliberately prompt and commit them, he was an active abettor. It may be observed of Audley, as Dean Hook has so truly remarked of Cranmer, “that in every infamous action of Henry he found a seconder” in his Chancellor, as he did in his Archbishop.

#### CROMWELL AND CRANMER ON THEOLOGY.

THE Landgrave of Hesse and his supporters “earnestly besought” Henry VIII. to “commit the Anabaptists to the flames ;” and in the same spirit Lord Cromwell denounced the Sacramentarians to-day as heretics, and to-morrow sent secret messages of comfort to their leaders. There can now be no question as to the fact that he was actuated by pecuniary considerations. Poor and obscure as the Anabaptists were, some of them possessed treasures of gold, &c., and were known

to Cromwell as money-lenders and usurers. In the case of Lambert, who was sent to the stake for denying the “Real Presence,” is to be found an expression of Cromwell’s private opinion on that main dogma of belief. He calls Lambert a “Sacramentary,” one who held the Lord’s Supper to be only a pious rite appointed to commemorate the death of Christ. In a letter to Sir Thomas Wyatt, Ambassador in Germany, Lord Cromwell says, “The King’s Majesty for the reverence of the Holy Sacraments did sit and preside at the disputation process of the miserable heretic who was burned on the 20th November. It was a wonder to see with what excellent majesty his Highness executed the office of Supreme Head; how benignly he essayed to convert the miserable man, and how strong his Highness argued against him.” Cromwell gave expression to the above sentiments in 1538—just the very time it was alleged (as until recently believed by many) he was a “staunch Lutheran,” and “a valiant soldier against the religion of Rome.” Cranmer was also stated to be secretly a Reformer at this time; yet at the above Council of disputation in favour of the Real Presence<sup>3</sup>, Collier describes Cranmer as seconding the King’s proofs “by new topics.” Gardiner followed in support of Cranmer; Tunstal took up the argument after Gardiner; and Stokesley and six other bishops brought fresh arguments in support of their predecessors, till they “silenced Lambert.” That they did not convince him may be gathered from his summary execution.

<sup>3</sup> In Collier’s “Eccles. Hist.” (vol. iv. pp. 32—46) is to be found an interesting analysis of Henry’s “Defence of the Seven Sacraments.” The Eucharist is the subject on which the Royal theologian chiefly displays his undoubted learning and research.

In all the transactions between Henry and his Archbishop of Canterbury, the scene in which Lambert was produced to argue the question of the “Real Presence” is perhaps the most remarkable. Westminster Hall was the place chosen for the discussion ; vast crowds of people “thronged the road thither” to offer homage to the King in his “mighty mission of defending the doctrine of the Real Presence in the Holy Sacrament of the altar.” King Henry appeared in magnificent robes seated on the throne, with cross-bearers, heralds, &c. ; the prelates in their robes were placed on his right ; the temporal peers on his left. The judges and all the eminent lawyers of the English Bar were seated behind the bishops, and the most favoured courtiers stood behind the peers. A flourish of trumpets, then a pause of a few minutes, and again, the tolling of divers bells, announced the entrance of the “heretic Lambert.” A blaze of lights and crosses surrounded the King. The Bishop of Chichester opened the Conference, and stated that though the King had disincorporated some monks, did away with images, and “reformed other matters” in the Church, he was determined to “maintain the purity of the Catholic faith,” and so forth. This statement may be taken as the approval of the majority of the episcopacy, who were still upholders of the chief *dogmata* of the Church, which, as time went on, and the license of royal prerogatives increased, were, one after another, with more or less unwillingness, finally abandoned<sup>4</sup>.

Lambert was a priest, and had twice been suspended for “irregularities ;” he then discovered that the cause

<sup>4</sup> Goodwin’s “Annals ;” Collier’s “Eccles. Hist.” pp. 151, 152 ; Hume, fol. edit. vol. iii. pp. 228, 229.

of his “human infirmities was to be traced to the false dogmas of Rome.” The discussion between the royal theologian, assisted by seven Bishops and Lord Cromwell, occupied five hours. At the conclusion, the King, addressing Lambert, said, “What sayest thou now, after the instructions of those learned and godly Bishops of mine? Art thou satisfied? Wilt thou live, or die?” “I throw myself on the mercy of your Highness,” replied Lambert. “Then,” said Henry, “thou must die, for I will not be the patron of heretics.” Cranmer and Cromwell applauded this sentiment, as it “showed the zeal and godly feeling of the King’s Highness for the doctrine of the Real Presence.” It is recorded by Dr. Whyte that Cranmer “never spoke better in his life; and the King several times laid his hand on his shoulder in an affectionate and approving manner.” Henry himself conducted the argument with ability and moderation, and showed a large amount of theological knowledge. Considering the subsequent career of those present, it was a strangescene. Hall the historian, who was an eye-witness, states that Lambert “showed no ability in the discussion, but considerable terror.” It was no wonder that the unhappy man should be in terror or despair when he beheld his supposed friends—men like Taylor, Barnes, Cranmer, and Cromwell, who had led him privately to believe they were of the same belief as himself—loud in their denunciation of his “heretical opinions,” and all agreeing in sending him to the stake. The judgment that he should “be consigned to the flames” was pronounced by Cromwell himself, who made an oration on the “blasphemous wickedness of denying the Real Presence.” Yet Maister Foxe has made an excuse

for Cromwell's conduct to Lambert, by stating that "he had him privately conveyed to his own house, where he begged his pardon for the manner in which he had treated him." But Foxe the martyrologist conveniently makes no mention of the fact that Cromwell was one of the officials present when Lambert was fastened to the stake. It might be argued, that Cromwell was compelled to appear there, and to act as he did, at the King's command—an excuse which could never be set up for an honest man; but his "private letter" to Wyatt places the whole question, from the memorable discussion to the scene at the stake, beyond doubt. We have on record, too, Burnet's opinion that, at this time, Cranmer did not believe in the "Real Presence"—another sad proof of his want of heart and integrity. Hume, also, states that whatever were the precise opinions of Cranmer and Latimer at the period of this discussion, they were "obliged to conform to the King's views." A melancholy admission in a case involving the interests of eternal truth!

Lambert conducted himself at the stake with great courage and fortitude "amidst the shouts of a savage mob."

From the commencement of his career in power Cranmer appears to have had a leaning for the stake. In a private note (dated June, 1533) to Sir John Hawkins, English Ambassador in Germany, the Archbishop thus wrote:—"One Frith, who was in the Tower, a prisoner, was commanded by the King's Grace to be examined before me, my Lord of London (Bonner), my Lord of Winchester (Gardiner), my Lord Suffolk, my Lord Chancellor, and my Lord of Wiltshire. Frith's opinion was so notably erroneous that we could not despatch him, but were obliged to leave

him to the determination of his ordinary, the Bishop of London. His said opinion is of such nature, that he thought it not necessary to believe, as an article of *our* faith, that there is the very corporeal presence of Christ within the Host and Sacrament of the altar, and holdeth on this point much after the opinion of *Æ*colampadius. *And surely I myself sent for him three or four times to persuade him to leave off that imagination;* but for all that we could do therein, he would not listen to any counsel. Notwithstanding, now he is at a final end with all examinations, and my Lord of London hath given sentence, and delivered the said Frith to the secular power, *so that he may look every day now to go unto the fire.* There is also condemned with him one Andrews, a tailor, for the selfsame opinions<sup>5</sup>."

With what cold-blooded indifference the Archbishop speaks of sending his fellow creatures to the flames!

In a letter to Osiander, Archbishop Cranmer complains of the "loose casuistry and mistaken opinions" put forth by the German divines of the "new learning," and "what scandal they gave to the Reformation." He says, "They allowed the younger sons of noblemen to entertain (to cohabit with) w \* \* \* \* s, to prevent the parcelling out of their estates, and lessening the figure of the elder family: that divines who allowed this liberty, were altogether unqualified to make invectives against any indulgence in the Church of Rome." "I desire," observes Cranmer, "to know what excuse can be made for your permission of a second marriage after divorce, while both the parties were living; and what is still worse, you allow a man a plurality of wives without the ceremony of a divorce. That this is a matter

<sup>5</sup> Ellis's "Royal Letters" (First Series), vol. ii. p. 40.

of fact, you acquainted me, as I remember, in some of your letters, adding withal, that Melancthon himself was present at one of these second weddings, and gave countenance to it. But this practice disagrees both with the nature of marriage, which does not make two, but *one* flesh ; and is likewise a clear contradiction of the Holy Scriptures<sup>6</sup>. It is plain from the institutions of our Saviour and His Apostles, that matrimony ought to be a single relation ; and that this engagement *must not be repeated till the death of one of the parties*. If you reply, The case of fornication must be excepted : if this is your answer, I desire to know whether the loss of the wife's honour was the reason of Melancthon's indulging the husband in polygamy ? If he went upon this ground, then we have the received doctrine of the Church, from the first ages to our own times, against this exposition. Now, we ought to interpret the Scriptures in conformity to the sense of the ancients. What St. Austin's opinion, or rather what the opinion of the Church was to the century in which this Father lived, he gives us to understand in his discourse to Pallinatius." The Archbishop continues, "I would gladly know how they (the German divines) disengaged themselves from this charge ? Whether they maintained the lawfulness of polygamy, and endeavoured to reconcile it with the New Testament ? or whether they believe something of condescension or connivance necessary to the present juncture ; and that unless they should relax a little upon this point, some greater mischief might happen ? If they go upon the first grounds (which I fancy they do not) they have more of the Turk than the Christian in them. And if they rely upon

<sup>6</sup> Matt. xix. ; Mark x. ; Luke xvi. ; Rom. vii. ; 1 Cor. vii.

the latter scheme, they will find themselves extremely encumbered; for which way can they indulge that liberty which Christ, His Apostles, and the whole Church has directly forbidden?"?

The importance of the foregoing document will be admitted even by the very few who have hitherto seen it—few, indeed, of the present generation. One of the great stand-points of the earlier German Reformers—especially of Luther—was the system of “indulgences,” so perverted, without the Church’s knowledge, by some clerics of the Roman faith. In no case, however, did the Vatican indulge licentious princes with a plurality of wives, or permit impatient libidinousness to supersede a wife. The fact of Luther sanctioning Philip of Hesse, however, in marrying an additional wife, to share his disjointed passion with a former one, was, it must be considered, a shameful sacrilege of what he had himself sworn to believe—and what the Christian world still regarded—a sacrament, that of marriage. This private opinion of Cranmer, written to his kinsman Osiander, is a striking proof of the difference between his convictions and his actions. With the consciousness here expressed, and Cranmer’s conduct in the case of Queen Katherine and Anna Boleyn, we seek in vain for an agreement. Was not, in fact, his conscience all through subservient to the remorseless will of Henry?

#### THE SIX ACTS.—DR. CRANMER’S DOMESTIC DIFFICULTY.

It would be very difficult to depict with fairness the real character of any leading man in the reign of Henry

<sup>7</sup> Collier’s “Eccles. Hist.” vol. iv. pp. 156, 157.

the Eighth. With the edifying exceptions of More and Fisher, the fitful conduct of the King enforced corresponding pliability in those around him. Some writers commend the demeanour of Gardiner during this reign, whilst others as violently denounce it. Cromwell, notwithstanding all that has been said and written, really lacked zeal in the cause of the Reformation—loving its gains more warmly than its dogmas—whilst Cranmer lost his courage in the cause before the fiery mutability of his dangerous master; but Gardiner, although he had seen all the severities practised against members of the olden creed, and had witnessed the butchery of the Countess of Salisbury and the outlawry of her son, managed, by his talents for business and his untiring obsequiousness, to render himself so necessary to Henry that he “out-Romanized all precedent,” and made for a while the first reforming King the deadliest enemy of Protestantism. The famous enactment of the Six Acts was sustained by Gardiner when it “became law,” but with far less severity than Henry had designed. That Act not only anathematized, but incarcerated and put to death those who denied the chief articles of the Roman creed. Through it thousands (says Foxe) were imprisoned and tortured, and one of its clauses, which ordained the celibacy of the clergy, compelled even Cranmer to forego the companionship of his wife. The statements of the numerous prosecutions under the Six Acts have been more or less exaggerated by different historians, who draw their information chiefly from Maister Foxe; but Dr. Maitland’s researches now prove that during the eight years in which the Six Acts were in force there were only twenty-five prosecutions; and with respect to these

twenty-five, it is even doubtful whether it was for a violation of this particular statute that men were condemned. "I believe," observes Dr. Maitland, "that the King was roused by an idea that the Church, of which he was resolved to be Supreme Head, was likely to be overthrown by a torrent of what he considered infidelity and blasphemy, and that he devised and insisted on, and would have carried, such a measure as he thought was suited to check the frightful evil. Such I believe to have been the origin of the Act<sup>8</sup>." Wilkins contends that the King drew up the Six Articles himself; and the fervent language used in relation to the "Real Presence" in the Sacrament is like the style and mode of argument used by the royal theologian. The impulsive Melancthon proclaims Gardiner and the Papal bishops as the authors of the Six Acts. In one of his letters to Henry VIII. on the subject of this enactment, he says, "Oh, cursed bishops! oh, wicked Winchester!" The man who here expresses his horror of the Six Acts was one of those who has written "approvingly" of Calvin having consigned Servetus to the flames: yet Melancthon was generally considered an "amiable and benevolent person<sup>9</sup>." It is probable, however, that his charges against Gardiner and the other Papal bishops rest on the statements of his English correspondents, Poynet and Bale. Pepys, in writing of the witnesses produced against Oliver

<sup>8</sup> Dr. Maitland's "Essays on the Reformation," p. 270.

<sup>9</sup> And to show how the new religionists differed amongst themselves, we find that Gentilis, Felix Mans, Rotman, Barneveldt, and others were sent to the stake by their co-believers. In fact, there was no unity in the new dispensation; and a protestation against the old religion seemed the only principle on which all agreed.

Plunket, in the days of Charles the Second, says, "I would not hang a dog on such testimony." The moral worth of Bale and Poynet could not suffer from any comparison with the worst men subsidized by Shaftesbury and Danby. Good old uxorious, loquacious Pepys would not have whipped a cur on their sworn oath.

There has been much misrepresentation as to the part taken in Parliament by the Papal and Anti-papal notables on the question of the "Six Acts." The subservient laics offered no opposition to the measure; but the Bishops discussed its merits for three days; and, although it was intended to exterminate the men who had adopted the "new learning," they had the charity and generosity to condemn such legislation. But it, nevertheless, was carried through both Houses. It has been stated by a recent biographer of Archbishop Cranmer that the latter absented himself from the House of Lords whilst this measure was pending, or at least that there is no record that he was present; but more recent examination proves, beyond a doubt, that he was not only present, but voted on every division which took place on the subject of the Bill, and adhered throughout to the principles propounded by his Sovereign, although on a preceding occasion he had the courage to argue with King Henry the merits of the Six Acts. From such perilous encounters of the mind, however, none knew better than Cranmer when to make a timely retreat. Foxe states that Cranmer opposed the Bill to the last; and Burnet reiterates the assertion. Those writers must not have searched deeply for their authorities, or they might have found journals and documents contradicting their assertion—amongst them a paper in the handwriting of a "lord of Parliament"

who was present, and gives a minute account of the manner in which his Grace of Canterbury adopted the King's views of the Six Acts. The Archbishop's excuse was, that "he became confounded by the goodly learning of the King's Highness." With regard to the administration of the measure, when it became law, the cautious Archbishop and his clergy of the province of Canterbury "evaded and tricked with it." The men chosen for carrying out the "Six Acts" were appositely taken from the monastic inquisitors, and seemed to have been selected from the thorough baseness of their characters.

Mr. Froude, who justly condemns the Six Acts, seems to feel that the conduct of the Reformers called for some measures of repression. He says, "The Six Acts Bill had been provoked by extravagances and excesses. It was still necessary to leave the Bishops some weapons to suppress disorder; but it should be a weapon with a blunter edge<sup>1</sup>."

In Edward's reign Cranmer caused the Six Acts to be repealed—a proceeding which met with the entire concurrence of the country. Upon the accession of Queen Mary the Commons re-enacted this statute; but when it reached the Lords, that assembly (led by Gardiner, Heath, and the entire bench of prelates) rejected it as a "disgrace to the Statute Book and a deep reflection upon the Christian charity of England." So much for the accuracy of the statements of Melancthon, Bucer, Coverdale, Foxe, and Burnet<sup>2</sup>.

Dean Hook states that the passing of the Six Acts

<sup>1</sup> Froude's "Hist. of England," vol. iv. p. 296.

<sup>2</sup> Stowe, Hume, vol. iii. (folio edit.); Turner, Lingard.

was more keenly felt by Cranmer than any other man : “ it broke up his happy home, divorced him from his wife for a season, and separated him from his children<sup>3</sup>. ” At the best, the “ wife and children ” were residing at Lambeth Palace in a mean, clandestine manner, which, if Mrs. Cranmer had been a high-spirited woman, she would not have submitted to ; but she could not have been high-spirited or independent : in a stranger land, even a German girl of seventeen might have, in more recent times, hesitated to become the clandestine wife of a man nearly fifty years of age. Osiander’s niece was well aware of the fact that, both in civil and canon law, a marriage with a priest or bishop was null and void. Therefore, as a wife, she must have known she had no legal existence. Dean Hook gives explanations which do not improve the aspect of this affair. “ Cranmer, ” he says, “ was probably enabled to live with his wife by rendering it difficult, if not impossible, for his adversaries to prove that a marriage between him and Margaret had ever taken place<sup>4</sup>. ”

Whenever Dean Hook refers to the marriage of Cranmer, he seems to do so with delicate reluctance.

<sup>3</sup> “ Archbishops of Canterbury, ” vol. vii. p. 106. He had no right to have wife or children according to the Canon Law and his solemn vows.

<sup>4</sup> Now, if it even were a virtuous act for a priest to perjure himself, or more mildly to put it, that a *suppressio veri* is commendable in “ reforming ” ancient misconceptions, the plan adopted was not honourable. Does the Dean admit a leman as befitting amongst the *personnel* of an Archbishop—and that Archbishop a “ Reformer ” ? “ A clandestine marriage is no marriage, but void in the sight of God and of His Church, ” is a statement for which there are theological grounds : but Mrs. Cranmer, we are informed, was not a woman of “ much refinement, ” and, we must suppose, adopted the situation, which, in Teutonic notions, may have been passably satisfactory.

“Though the marriage was known,” writes the Dean, “it was not publicly announced.” It was never known publicly until it was adduced as an example when King Edward the Sixth was in the hands of the unprincipled Seymours. “Mrs. Cranmer was visited by the Archbishop’s personal friends” (we are informed by Dean Hook), “yet on public occasions she was kept in the background.” Who were the personal friends of the Archbishop who visited his cryptogamic establishment at Lambeth, Canterbury, or the supplementary manors of his see? Did any of the wives and daughters of the nobility of England visit Mrs. Cranmer? The profusion of public entertainments was remarkable in those days, and we find other bishops having as guests the nobles, their wives, and daughters, whose presence at the house of Mrs. Cranmer and the Archbishop we can in no way discover. The “personal friends” mentioned by Dean Hook must have been such men as John Poynet, Miles Coverdale, Latimer, Ridley, Hooper, John Bale, Edward Cranmer, &c., all men who, like Archbishop Cranmer himself, had violated their vows and had wives or mistresses. These men and their “ladies” are the only “personal friends” of Archbishop Cranmer whom the niece of Osianer had an opportunity of consorting with in England. And here is it not apposite to ask, why does not the law up to this very day acknowledge the wife of a Protestant bishop? The bishop has a territorial title, yet the law only accords his spouse the right of any plebeian wife—taking merely the surname of her husband. Elizabeth never hesitated to express her dislike of married bishops or priests; and few readers of history can forget her gross and ungrateful saying to “Mrs. Archbishop” Parker

(by-the-way, the wife of another broken-vowed priest), when she came to thank her for her splendid hospitality at her husband's house:—"I do not know by what name to call you. My Archbishop of Canterbury cannot have a wife—that is impossible; neither can he have a concubine; but, whoever you are, or whatever you may be, *I thank you.*" We agree with Dean Hook in his just censure of language like this uttered by Queen Elizabeth; but the use of it was exceedingly appropriate in the mouth of the daughter of such a father; yet Henry himself was not so coarse with Cranmer, when he asked him sneeringly whether his "bedroom at Lambeth Palace would bear a search?"

Dean Hook describes the condition of Cranmer's mind when the Six Acts were put into operation: "He still *devoutly celebrated mass*; and celebrating mass, he could not deny the dogma of transubstantiation. . . . . *He consoled himself for the absence of his wife by learned discussions with Ridley.*" And so, up to the time of Henry's death (1547), the Archbishop was "devoutly celebrating mass" for thirteen years as a prelate; and on every occasion he deliberately committed, according to his own public teaching, a fresh sacrilege and a fresh perjury at the altar. Now can any conscientious human being—we will insult no creed by appealing to its adherent by name—say that this conduct of Cranmer was that of a man with the slightest pretension to honour or honesty? At the very best, his life was a fearful hypocrisy. Who can advocate him? who can cleanse the memory of a man whose existence for long years bore false testimony to all the principles of virtue and honour? Cranmer is by too many credited with having reformed the olden Church, or established

a new one: did he reform himself? Even if he believed in the new faith, what can excuse his long-standing falsehood and dissimulation in practising the old, and incurring (we fear too consciously) the awful responsibility of accumulated sacrilege?

In the discussion on the Sacraments in Convocation, Cranmer contended “that *auricular confession should be maintained*; he called on the Bishops and clergy to warn the people that they must give no less faith and credence to the same words of absolution, so pronounced by ministers of the Church, than they would give unto the very words of God Himself if He should speak with us out of heaven, according to the saying of Christ: ‘Whose sins soever you retain, they are retained.’ And in another place Christ saith, ‘Whosoever be with you, heareth Me.’” This opinion of Cranmer’s was also deliberately written and printed in the “Institution of a Christian Man<sup>5</sup>. ” Yet, strange to say, one of the “many virtues” ascribed to Cranmer by so-called historians has been his hostility to the confessional! Such is the honest mode in which history has been prevalently written for the English people. We cannot help saying there would be an inevitable change in all truth-loving minds if the masses had the courage to read outside of those histories whose success has been secured in proportion to their misrepresentation or intolerance. Dean Hook admits that the article touching the Real Presence in the “Christian Man” shows that Cranmer believed in “the corporeal presence of our Lord in that ordinance.” But what Cranmer wrote is no proof of what he thought or believed. The King maintained the doctrine of the Real Presence, and

<sup>5</sup> “Archbishops of Canterbury,” vol. vii. p. 217.

the Sacrament of Penance, and his Archbishop professed to hold and maintain the same opinions—as he might have held and professed Islamism, if Henry in his caprice had adopted the creed of the Crescent, as he had, in one regard at least, its practice. Dean Hook, without seeming to see it, makes an acknowledgment which confirms still more the dishonesty of Cranmer. The Dean says that all the changes of religious observance which took place in Edward's reign were digested and arranged in Henry's time; yet in the latter period Cranmer acted on the reverse principle; for he imprisoned, tortured, and even burnt men and women with whom he secretly agreed, if his Protestantism was sincere, concealed his sentiments during the reign of Henry, and declared himself only when it was safe and lucrative, under the avaricious Duke of Somerset. But this phase of his career shall be duly treated in the pages on the reign of the boy-King.

Cranmer was not without meeting some personally awkward incidents in connexion with the Six Acts. In 1538-39 a Scottish priest, named Alexander Ales, became a professor at Cambridge under the patronage of Lord Cromwell. Of the character of this man we may judge from his patrons. Having "tampered with Catholic principles" to a certain extent, and the Six Acts being proposed to Parliament, Cromwell set aside his Scotch professor<sup>6</sup>. Ales made known his

<sup>6</sup> Lord Cromwell, who ranked in the House of Peers "above the Bishops and next to royal blood," was also introduced by the King into Convocation as his Vicar-General; and Cromwell, in turn, ushered in Alexander Ales as his theologian, and Ales sometimes spoke on subjects expressive of his patron's opinions on the dogmas and discipline of the Church. Timid as the Convocation were, they indignantly censured Cromwell's conduct in intruding his creature;

grievances to Archbishop Cranmer, who, having heard that the professor was secretly married to a “pretty little Cambridge girl”—perhaps a “Dolphin barmaid”—expressed his sympathy for Ales. At an interview, Cranmer informed him that he could no longer extend protection to married priests; that the statute of the Six Acts was imperative on that matter. He advised him to leave the country, and repair at once to Germany. “Happy man that you are,” observed the Archbishop, “you can escape. I wish that I could do the same. Truly, my See would be no hindrance to me. And now you must make all haste to quit the island before a blockade is established, unless you are willing to sign the decree, as I have done. I have sealed it, compelled by fear. I repent of what I have done, and if I had known that my only punishment would have been deposition from my archbishopric—as I hear my Lord Latimer is deposed—of a truth I would not have subscribed. I am grieved that you have been deprived of your salary by my Lord Cromwell, and that you have no funds for your travelling expenses, and that I have no ready money: I dare not mention this to my friends, lest the King should become aware that I have given you warning to escape, and that I have provided you with the means of travelling. I give you,

and even Cranmer, whether impelled by *esprit de corps* or anger at the high-handedness of Cromwell, joined in his brethren’s reprobation. Sooth to say, however, as Cromwell was forced upon the Convocation by Henry, and would obtrude his opinions on theological subjects, he did require some expositor, his own early education among freebooters being poorly calculated to impart a knowledge of divinity. In the “Archbishops of Canterbury” (vol. vii. pp. 181, 182) the reader will find chronicled the particulars of those unedifying scenes, derived from contemporary records. Therein Dean Hook regards Cromwell as being “as ignorant of theology as of every other learned subject.”

however, this ring, as a token of my friendship. It at one time belonged to Thomas Wolsey, and it was presented to me by the King when he gave me the Archbishopric of Canterbury<sup>7</sup>.” Wolsey’s ring presented by Cranmer to an obscure priest who had broken his vows! Such a consignment manifested in Cranmer much meanness, great ingratitude, and an utter want of delicacy. If the interview were not proved by the State Papers to be a fact, the occurrence would appear to be invented. Another consideration will strike the reader on perusing the circumstances of this interview. We have presented a heartless monarch, indulging in all licentiousness himself, yet seeking, in moments of remorse, to have the spiritual conduct of his kingdom adjusted to canonical rule. Henry, conscious of incapacity or will to conquer his passions, wished, from a sentiment thoroughly intelligible, that his people should not be so bad as himself, and therefore impressed an abstinence from license upon even the “spiritual advisers” whom he had himself estranged. “Heureux le peuple,” says Fenelon, “qui est conduit par un sage roi.” Henry’s passions and prejudices had destroyed his chances of wisdom: those who were capable of good counsel the axe and the dungeon had consumed.

Many years after the deaths of Henry and Cranmer Ales related to Queen Elizabeth the particulars of the above remarkable conversation between himself and the Archbishop of Canterbury<sup>8</sup>.

<sup>7</sup> “State Papers of Elizabeth’s reign,” p. 533.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*

THE RELIGIOUS INSTITUTIONS OF OLDEN ENGLAND.

[Part II.]

IN St. Andrew's Priory, Northampton, one of the prepared declarations of crime was presented by the inquisitors to the monks to sign, and it received the signature of the prior and eleven of the brotherhood. In this instance, as in many others, “it was all a matter of form ;” “every thing would be set right again :” the monks made their offerings to the inquisitors ; and *that* day’s proceedings closed. Here is a passage in the confession, signed by the eleven monks, one of whom was nearly blind, and another bedridden from age :— “Our long and wicked hypocrisy, cloaked with feigned sanctity, we have been revolving daily, and continually pondering in our sorrowful hearts, and thereby perceiving the bottomless gulf of everlasting fire ready to devour us, if, persisting in this state of living, we should depart from this uncertain and transitory life, constrained by the intolerable anguish of our conscience, caused as we trust, by the grace of God, who would have no man to perish in sin ; with hearts most contrite and repentant, prostrate at the noble feet of your most royal Majesty, most lamentably do crave of your Highness your abundant mercy to grant unto us most dreadful sinners against God and your Highness, pardon for our wicked deeds and many omissions, as we hereby confess them to be.” This statement, like many others, had been drawn up by the inquisitors themselves. It may seem incredible that the poor monks should have signed documents so self-criminatory. But a generalization of the condition of sinful humanity

is a prevailing sentiment with the humble and the good. It is also impossible to say what false pretences were used to induce the victims to sign. In a brief time, however, even this hypocrisy was abandoned, and the more honest system of open plunder adopted. A contemporary (Whyte), who knew many signatories—"both monks and inquisitors"—doubts if even the signatures to some of the confessions are genuine." Indeed it is an ascertained fact that the signatures of some who were remarkable for the purity and holiness of their lives were placed in a prominent position as the confessors of abominable crimes. The Rev. Mr. Blunt repeats:—"The real fact is, that these contemptible documents are 'cut-and-dry' forms which were placed before the monks and friars for signature without any regard for their knowledge of the contents. It is quite probable that some, in their despair, grew indifferent to every thing, as old people will, and, when they were told to sign their names to a document, did so."

Those also who had already charged their brethren with vice and crime, at the instigation of Cromwell and the inquisitors, and in the hope of reward, would, of course, do so without any scruple. But many houses would have nothing to do with the "surrender," and gave the inquisitors much trouble, "some refusing to the last." . . . "Let it not be supposed that the documents called 'surrenders' really speak the truth as to the spirit in which the monks quitted their monasteries. A judicial mind, otherwise well informed as to the history of the transactions they professed to represent" (says Mr. Blunt), "must reject them at once, and will have little hesitation in saying that they have the

nature of malicious forgery, got up by such unscrupulous men as London, Layton, and Leigh." The Abbot of Vale Royal, proved that the "surrender" made in his name, and that of his fourteen monks, was a forgery. Nevertheless, they were turned adrift upon the world<sup>9</sup>.

The correspondence with Cromwell of Rice, the inquisitor, is sufficiently contradictory, especially respecting his visit to the Abbot of Walden, whom he represents as "a man of good learning and right sincere judgment;" but the abbot has an "awful secret" which his burdened conscience discloses to the man who is most likely to make it public. The abbot has a wife and children; he "could not do without a young spouse;" the "laws of man refuse this happiness to him, but it was lawful by the ordinances of heaven to do so." . . . "He threw himself upon the mercy of the inquisitor. . . . His case is laid before Lord Cromwell, who felt a sympathy for his condition; tells him to use caution and avoid scandal as much as possible<sup>1</sup>." The reader must bear in mind that, according to the commission issued, and the "questions to be put," a violation of celibacy was one of the most fatal crimes to be attributed to "either monk, friar, or nun." This opinion was proclaimed by Cromwell himself in the King's name, and in his master's presence. How then could he have secretly approved of the marriage of the abbot? Besides the ingenuous Vicar-General was always apprehensive of the monks and friars "playing some game with him in order to entrap himself and his commissioners." Cromwell suspected

<sup>9</sup> Supp. "Monastic Houses," p. 244.

<sup>1</sup> MSS. State Paper Office, Henry VIII. SS. vol. xxxv.

every body; self-conscious, he had no faith in the honesty of any man; and believed one of his old companions amongst the Italian brigands to have as much integrity as either prelate or prince—a doctrine he acted on or forbore just as it suited. Cromwell never made this alleged case known to the King. And again, how did the abbot conceal his “wife and children” from the knowledge of the monks, who were austere and rigid disciplinarians; and the hundreds of gossiping people who came daily to the monastery for milk, bread, and meat; also the old servants, the labourers, the “poor gentlemen and pilgrims,” who were constantly “coming and going”? When the real character of the abbot is considered, and that of the inquisitor, who cohabited with two sisters; of Cromwell’s professed opinions of celibacy and the Real Presence, the credibility of such an accusation can be readily estimated. Other abbots are represented as introducing their daughters—girls of sixteen and twenty years of age—to the inquisitors; that the “monks in those putrid places knew of the misconduct of the heads of their establishments, but had also sinned themselves;” yet other inmates of the “same house spent hours daily and nightly in prayer and mortification;” and “had a vigilant eye on all their brethren.” Were the “gossiping old servants,” the “labourers and poor

<sup>2</sup> In vol. i. p. 187 to 190 of Stephens’s “Monastic Houses,” the reader will find the rules of the Benedictine Order, on which the government of all other houses in England was based. And, from the minute record of the mode in which these rules were carried out—every incident set down in the record of the existence of these monks, who were subordinate to the strictest code of discipline, it is utterly impossible that the preposterous crimes attributed to any house of this—in fact of any—order could have been in any shape true.

gentlemen" bribed into silence? Did the peasantry, the country squires, and visitors, who so frequently came for "a dinner," or perhaps to borrow money, discover nothing in the conduct or bearing of the abbot who was seen on the steps of the altar at four o'clock in the morning, surrounded by numbers of lay and clerical inmates? The admission that there were some good monks in the priory is less worth notice than the false accusation—in fact, it enhances the villainy of the informer, for it was merely made for the purpose of giving an appearance of candour to a shameless perjury. The attempt to secure an excuse for the confiscation of the religious houses involved far more nefarious and unworthy elements in the reign of Henry, than did the open rapine of Somerset and his brother "nobles" during the Protector's short rule over England and the pitiable Edward.

Dr. London was one of the inquisitors who visited the Abbey of Reading (1539). In one of his letters to Lord Cromwell, he says, "I demanded the Abbot's relics, which he readily showed me; and I took an inventory of them, and locked them up by the side of the high altar. . . . There is a daily lecture at this Abbey on some part of Scripture, in English and in Latin, which are well attended, and the Abbot presides at the same." Dr. London details to Lord Cromwell the false hopes he "held out to the Abbot and monks, who seemed pliable"—terror-stricken would more fittingly represent the Inquisitor's meaning; but, whether London's report was good or bad, the community at Reading was doomed. The destruction of the Abbey was quickly accomplished: the Abbot was impeached for high treason, and, shortly after, hanged and quar-

tered. Several of the monks were also hanged in their habits, and the remainder of them were scattered through the country. Thus fell the Abbey of Reading, after having continued in a state of splendour and magnificence, presided over by thirty-one abbots, for a period of 400 years. The whole building was demolished, and the materials, together with the timber, sold. The library was almost entirely destroyed, and the plate and jewellery were not returned to the Crown by the inquisitors. The history of the Abbey, and of the many notables who frequented it, or died there, is one of much interest<sup>3</sup>. Layton desecrated and plundered York Cathedral, of which he was himself the unworthy dean; and his treatment of the fine old Norman abbey of Battle, in Sussex, adds, if possible, to his infamy.

The Abbot of Woburn was hanged at his own gate by order of Lord Russell, whom tradition represents as having been present on the occasion. On the following day, twelve monks of the same establishment were hanged and quartered. Amongst the victims was Charles Fortescue, aged eighty-six.

The instructions given by Cromwell were quite in agreement with some of his memoranda still extant. “Item, to remember *all the jewels* of all the monasteries in England, and specially for the cross at Paul’s, of emeralds. Item, to remember my Lord of Canterbury *his best mitre* to be demanded in lieu of the King’s legacy.” One of the inquisitors, writing to Cromwell, says, “I have taken from three houses 800 ounces of plate. We have taken in the Monastery of St.

<sup>3</sup> “Monastic Memorials;” “History of Reading;” Gough’s “Sepulchral Monuments;” Sandford, Dugdale, and Stephens.

Edward's 5000 marks in gold and silver, also a rich cross, with emeralds and divers stones of great value . . . the household stuff and ornaments of the Church of Leicester, which amount unto 228 pounds. The plate is valued at, by weight, 190 pounds.<sup>3</sup> In the account given by the "King's jewel-keeper," the quantity of plate thus set down is 14,531 ounces of gold, 207,635 of silver-gilt, and 67,000 ounces of silver, or about nine tons of gold and silver plate<sup>4</sup>.

These returns fall far short of the real estimate of the gold, silver, and valuables seized, for Cromwell and the inquisitors made ample selections for themselves before rendering an account to the general repository of the plunder—the royal Treasury. For instance, the golden chalice of the great Saxon Archbishop, Odo, found in the convent of "Winchelcombe" (now the picturesque little town of Winchcombe, in Gloucestershire), was presented to Cranmer by Lord Cromwell, and subsequently used for "household purposes" by Edward Whitechurch the printer, who married Cranmer's widow. The Augustinian Priory of Twinham had amongst its precious curiosities a silver box containing four autograph letters of Edward the Confessor. This box and its contents were presented by Layton to Sir Thomas West, ancestor of the present Delawarr family, whose servant burned the letters, and melted down the invaluable antique which had contained them for so many centuries. The letters of Henry the Sixth, and of his heroic Queen (Margaret of Anjou), to the Abbess of Godstowe were likewise destroyed. One of the evicted nuns has recorded that those documents

<sup>3</sup> Ellis's Orig. "Royal Letters," vol. ii.; "Supp. of Monas." Camden Society, p. 163; Blunt's "English Reformation."

contained a touching narrative of the Queen's sufferings; that the "King always sought the prayers of the community in support of the royal cause;" and that, in one of his letters, written on Good Friday, King Henry, sick at heart at the world's turmoil, and wearied by his sad vicissitudes, wrote, "After all, the inhabitants of the cloister are the only true philosophers<sup>5</sup>." One cannot help, in contemplating the destruction of such inestimable relics as these, inquiring what good religion, or what moral purpose, could have been founded or served by vandalism like this? Hoby, speaking of the literary treasures thus destroyed throughout the kingdom, averred that they were "swept away with the accumulated rubbish of monks and nuns." Alas! yes. "By their deeds must posterity decide on the character of these Goths," says, indignantly, a recent writer; and every lover of the ancient virtue, glory, and learning of our country must join in his indignant denunciation. Maister Hoby himself, the ruthless applauder of such wanton sacrilege, received much treasure, and many valuable manors of the common spoil, and still remained dissatisfied.

John Bale, once a Carmelite friar, but who became a prominent promoter of the Reformation, says, "A great part of the monastic treasures was turned to the

<sup>5</sup> Letter of Teresa Olgate, one of the evicted sisterhood of Godstowe, to Dr. Whyte, Bishop of Winchester, on the destruction of the monastic MS. libraries. This venerable lady died in poverty at Ipswich, in her ninety-fourth year. Dr. Whyte was the successor of Gardiner in the See of Winchester; he was deposed by Elizabeth, and died in prison. He was a man of extensive learning, and a virtuous and zealous prelate, being the last Catholic Bishop of Winchester. The Reformers describe him as "a man of stainless character, but he clung to Popery, for which he suffered."

upholding of dice-playing, masking, and banqueting. Yea, bribing, w——, and swearing<sup>6</sup>?"

Within the last seven years documents have been discovered which disclose many new facts regarding the monastic inquisition. In 1536 a commission was issued to certain country gentlemen, in conjunction with nominees of the Court, who were required to report on the condition of the smaller monasteries. The reports from the three counties of Leicester, Warwick, and Rutland have lately been brought to light. These commissioners entered into a detailed statement of the condition of each monastery which they visited, and of the character sustained by its members, including "servants and pensioners." We find that almost all were in debt, and that in many the houses were ruinous; that in some the inmates were desirous of being secularized; but out of nineteen houses visited there is *only one* in which the commissioners found the existence of delinquency. This fact should fairly be taken into account when the subject is considered, and no one with a sense of justice can fail to suspect foul play when he sees this commission dropped, and fresh commissioners appointed, not one of whom seems to be of a serious or religious turn of mind, whilst charges of immorality were brought against them all, and in one case fully established<sup>7</sup>.

Eleven thousand monastic houses, containing 116,000 inmates, in a country where the whole population was only 3,436,000 was regarded as out of proportion, and a considerable decrease was contemplated by the heads of the Church; but in a very different manner from

<sup>6</sup> Strype, p. 346.

<sup>7</sup> Dean Hook's "Archbishops of Canterbury," vol. iv.

that carried out by the King. It must, however, be borne in mind that those houses employed more than two hundred thousand people—men, women, and children—who were well fed and clothed. If there are many Protestant witnesses to bear evidence against the monastic houses, there is testimony of an infinitely superior description in those distinguished Protestant writers who have dedicated a great portion of their lives to the investigation of the character and labours of the abbeys and convents of England. Mr. Blunt says, “A large monastery was a market for much produce, and an employer of labour in many necessary branches of industry. Although it was a rule of all monks that labour should accompany prayer, their labours were most frequently those of the cloister, not the labours of the workshop and the field. *They studied much; supplied the country with books when printing was yet unknown; composed learned and laborious works on Holy Scripture, theological and secular subjects, and spent their time generally in that kind of brain-work which the ignorant put down as unproductive study.* Many a modern artisan or tradesman, moving in a narrow circle, and used to much muscular exertion, would certainly set down the work of writing of these pages as little better than idleness; and claim for themselves the special designation of ‘working men.’ Such was, doubtless, the foundation of those charges of idleness brought against a studious, brain-working class of monks; and it was not considered that they who thus held large endowments were by that very brain-work providing manual labourers with the employment which brought them bread. The brain-workers were scattered to the winds, without books,

money, or means of carrying on their work ; and the manual workers who had hitherto supplied their wants were no longer required. Thus it is fair to think that if only half the monks were students, and the other half a kind of cloistered labourers, even fifty thousand gentlemen of some means and refinement of sentiment, cast into sudden beggary, must have drawn down with them not a few thousand of those who had provided for their needs<sup>8</sup>." Here is the result of a calm and candid consideration of one phase of the monastic question. There is no reference to that olden tact and comprehensive charity which rendered hunger an un-English malady. The death of the monasteries was the birth of the poor-laws, which have peopled the land with dissatisfied mendicancy and unexampled crime.

Sybilla Newdegate, the last Prioress of the Benedictine house of Halliwell, near Bishopsgate Street, received no pension, because she and her sisterhood, like Catherine Bulkley and the nuns of Godstowe, had made efforts to oppose the monastic inquisitors, and would not silently submit to their proceedings. Sybilla Newdegate belonged to an old family in Warwickshire which in previous ages had added several members to the long roll of abbots and abbesses amongst the religious orders of England. Thorndale says he cannot trace the good Prioress of Halliwell after the dissolution, and Dr. Whyte supposes that, like so many others of the dispossessed, she perished from want. The principal feature in the house of Halliwell seems to have been the affording protection to young females who would otherwise be exposed to the dangers of London.

<sup>8</sup> Rev. J. H. Blunt's "Reformation of the Church of England," pp. 381, 382.

Alice Fitzherbert, Margaret Hardwicke, and Jane Hinford, who presided over Benedictine houses in Warwickshire, also ended their days in poverty. Every reader is pretty well aware that a descendant of the Abbess Sybilla Newdegate's family is at present, as Member of Parliament for North Warwickshire, noted for his unreasoning hatred of the religion of his ancestors. Yet he owes a good deal to the Catholic religion, for a goodly portion of his income is derived from the confiscated manor of Albury Priory. The hon. member often expatiates on the wickedness of the monks, which argues, of course, opposite virtues in their censor. Then why should this equitable judge continue to enjoy property derived from so sinful a source? In Sir William Dugdale's "Warwickshire" Mr. Newdegate, and those who hold his opinions, will find many interesting records of the convents of the once thoroughly Catholic county of Warwick—which was proud in naming the last great Baron of England. In Willis's "History of Abbeys" (vol. ii.) appear the names of some notable abbesses. Attention may also be called to Leland's "Collect," Maddox's "Formul," Bishop Tanner's "Monastica," and Stephens's "Monastic Houses" (vols. i. and ii.). Are civilian folly and intense ignorance of the Catholic religion and the catholic courtesy of human nature to resume, in the nineteenth century, the Cromwellian inquisition of the sixteenth?

Mr. Hugo, in his "Mediæval Nunneries of Somersetshire," states that the establishments of religious females have, perhaps, suffered more in reputation from the exaggerated efforts to present them as models of perfection and impeccability than they have from the

malice of their enemies—that is, that the extreme landations of Catholic writers have weakened belief in what was really as good and virtuous as human nature can accomplish.

There are instances amongst the monastic records of abbesses and prioresses having been set aside for “the tyranny they exercised over sisterhoods;” some were “austere and gloomy,” others “possessed of the infirmity of an ungovernable temper or a peevish, un-conciliatory disposition,” and others again “were too gentle or kindly” to rigidly carry out the severe discipline practised in some houses. The English maidens of those times were as high-spirited and independent as their fathers and brothers; and any thing like undue harshness caused a revolt against an abbess. There were also instances of sisterhoods becoming insubordinate, and refusing to obey their superiors, and inciting others to do so. In such cases they were “sent to houses at a distance, and severe penance inflicted,” and then “if they did not return to their duty, they were absolved from their vows.” These cases were rare; and in a search through papers bearing on six different houses for the period of 107 years, we find the house at Shepley in a state of insubordination—“six sisters having rebelled,” but in “three months five of them returned to their duty, and the sixth died at her father’s home.” At Bolton, one sister had broken her vows in a community of thirty; her offence was the only one entered on the books of a serious nature for 93 years. In some houses there were only from 20 to 30 of what might be termed venial—indeed childish—offences against the rules for a space of 74 years. The smallest incident was entered daily, and signed and

countersigned, and then rigidly inspected by the Bishop and other ecclesiastical visitors. Falsehood or misrepresentation in these books was impossible. With these exceptions, so edifyingly trifling, the English sisterhoods were the truest, the purest, the most disinterested, and the most self-sacrificing daughters the Church possessed within her fold<sup>9</sup>. And those who have been so long loading their memory with vituperation, false and foul, seem to have forgotten that Satan is the father of lies, and that Charity is amongst the most sacred, as well as most amiable, of Christian virtues.

Cranmer, when a Fellow of Jesus College, Cambridge, wrote to the Abbess of Godstowe in these words: "I send you, by Stephen Whyte, forty shillings, as it be Christmas time, for the comfort of the sickly children of the poor. I beg that my soul's health be remembered in your prayers, and those of the little innocent children. I recommend you to the care and protection of the Holy Virgin Mother.—T. C." At this time Cranmer was a poor man, but throughout life he was ready to share his means in acts of benevolence. In another communication to the Abbess of Godstowe, Dr. Cranmer wrote, "Stephen Whyte hath told me that you lately gathered around you a number of wild peasant maids, and did make to them a most goodly discourse on the health of their souls; and you sheweth to them how goodly a thing it be for them to go often-

<sup>9</sup> In Dugdale's "Monasticon Anglicanum" are chronicled the ancient rules of some very austere orders of nuns, who lived on bread, vegetables, and water. The account of the division of labour; the mode of receiving visitors (none but female); the penances enjoined; the attention to the sick poor; their quaint dress; the hours of rising; prayer, &c.—are all minutely set down.

times to confession. I am mighty glad of your discourse<sup>1</sup>."

In a preceding chapter the reader has seen the "earnest appeal" Cranmer made in Convocation, many years subsequent, in favour of the Sacrament of Penance.

The Benedictine Convent of Gloucester was long remembered with feelings of veneration and regret by the people. There is still extant a MS. containing an account of the simple mode of life, the chastity, the piety, and the daily round of good works performed by its sisterhood—women of high birth, some of them royal ladies; of the crowd of people who came for relief and advice; the village quarrels they settled; of the social comforts they conferred on the needy and ailing; and even their kindness to the outlaw, who approached their gates with a veneration he felt for no other portals. Before the art of printing was invented the sisterhood of this establishment wrote moral essays and tales, which they read and explained to the village maidens on summer evenings; goodly discourses were likewise delivered on housewifery, the rearing of children, &c. In the library of this Benedictine house were two MS. books of rare interest, indited in a small neat hand, one on the Crusades, by Mary Rivers; another, on the history of King Arthur, by Theresa Fitzwalter; also four Latin letters of an English nun (1448) from Dublin, describing the Irish sisterhoods; their "love of the poor, their severe labours, the humility of noble and royal ladies in the cloister; their strange dresses, their crucifixes and little bells, and the profound reverence with which they were treated by the turbulent chiefs and people." The Latin letters,

<sup>1</sup> "Monastic Houses of England," p. 32.

it is alleged, were carried to France, and placed in the library of the Archbishop of Paris<sup>2</sup>. It is an interesting fact that the office of lady abbess in this ancient Saxon convent was filled successively for ninety years by three queens. The practice of retiring to convents and monasteries was frequent amongst the highest blood of Christendom. Surely people like these abstracting themselves voluntarily from the world must be credited with sincerity, even if they be accused by the enemies of their creed of eccentricity or superstition. It proves that they believed in the Divine origin of their religion, and it confirms their co-believers of the present day in the conviction that the men of the Reformation who attempted to overthrow that faith, and who despoiled its altars and refuges of the poor, were not the best qualified to found and establish an antagonistic worship. There is no want of Protestant evidence as to how the inmates of the cloister were occupied, or what they did to promote morality and education. “The monks were good tutors for the education of youth; every convent had from four to six teachers, who gave instruction to the children of the neighbourhood free of all charges; and grammar, writing, music, and divers other things were also taught. Nunneries were likewise good schools for young maidens, to which all manner of girls goeth. The daughters of lords, knights, and squires were taught to read and write; sometimes Latin, French, and music; and many other things for their station. The modesty and the chastity of the pupils, and the ladies who instructed them, was never questioned. . . . If such feminine foundations were extant in later times, perhaps some

<sup>2</sup> Thorndale’s “Memorials of English Abbeys,” p. 14.

virgins of noble blood would be glad of such places.” The merits of the monks as historians are likewise acknowledged. “They were the sole historians in writing for centuries, to preserve the remarkable passages of Church and Commonwealth. . . . Whilst the monks’ pens were employed in learned labours, the nuns wrote histories also: that of Christ His Passion, for their altar cloths; Scripture relations and stories in hangings of great beauty, to adorn their convents. Their labours were incessant, and all worthy of commendation.” The Carmelite Fathers were remarkable for the care and accuracy with which they chronicled every incident in connexion with the history of their order. Leland enumerates more than 150 Carmelite writers in England alone, and John Bale affirms that they were the most “learned amongst the religious bodies in the realm<sup>3</sup>. ” If these learned fathers had possessed the advantage of printing, which, by-the-way, was invented by Catholics, how much might they have done for the cause of religion and civilization! The products of their intellect could not, at all events, have been so extensively destroyed by the Reformers if they had been disseminated in print instead of being confined to manuscript.

The next testimony we produce as to the character of the nunneries is that of a distinguished Anglican clergyman, the Rev. Mr. Hugo, whose researches amongst the mediaeval MSS. and records of the religious houses of Somersetshire are most interesting productions of recent literature. “It was,” Mr. Hugo writes of Canyngton, “a school of graces, and for many ages a centre of all refined and refining influences. The

<sup>3</sup> Rymer, Fuller, Collier, Godwin, and Brewer.

memory of its varied excellences will suggest to honest and teachable minds the duty of looking justly, and therefore kindly, on its efforts.” But good works and a holy life commanded neither respect nor pity from Lord Cromwell’s agents. Cecilia Varney, the prioress of Canyngton, was to have received an annual pension of ten marks, but amongst the papers on the dissolution there is no mention of even that small sum being paid to her. The sympathies of the people were with Cecilia Varney and her sisterhood; they were grateful for past services to them as tenants and retainers. The tenants of the convent were principally cottagers, with a few acres of land allotted to each holding; those holdings had been occupied by four and five generations consecutively; they enjoyed every social comfort, “according to their station;” they were virtuous, peaceable, and industrious people. Whenever any disputes arose between them, they submitted their case to the Prioress, by whose judgment all parties abided. The young village maidens were trained in religion, and instructed in all the domestic duties which might befit them for their future position in the world. The sisters delivered lectures on various subjects, which were a source of instruction and amusement to youth. “The pleasing face of contentment and virtue smiled on every village green.” But when the sisterhood was dispersed, the scene was changed. Of this period Mr. Hugo says, “Out of their conventual home, so long the abode of security and peace, they were turned to brave the inclement storms, and to struggle against the unexperienced hardships and temptations of a world which they had known only from a safe vantage-ground, destitute of any friends or protectors, save those whom

a recollection of their former estate, respect for their character, or compassion for their sufferings, might raise up and attract. Who can worthily picture the silent and secret martyrdom of those evil days?"

The yearly revenue of Canyngton, out of which so many benefits had been bestowed upon the people, did not amount to 40*l.*, and is now valued at about 800*l.* This confiscated property of religion and the poor was granted to one of Henry's retainers named Edward Rogers.

Mr. Hugo points out in what reverence and esteem the convents were held, from the fact that they were constantly employed as a safe and trusted asylum for the women and children of England during the temporary absence from home of their fathers and husbands, either on private business or in the service of their country. The Rev. Mr. Hugo continues, "In reviewing the history of Mynchin-Barrow, I would direct attention to the fact, that we have here not only a picture of the numerous excellences of the monastic system, but also a specimen of those several blemishes which really constituted the defects of the female communities of mediæval times. Even this latter peculiarity, however, is valuable, as it furnishes us with a knowledge of the actual state of such establishments, in contradistinction to those erroneous and distorted fancies in which the moderns have been pleased to indulge. For several centuries it has been sedulously endeavoured to be inculcated that the monasteries of mediæval England were so many focuses of impurity and impiety, where lust and intemperance ruled supreme, and where the holy vows which preceded the abandoned life only made the contact between each more fearful and repulsive.

An examination of the morals of the monastic houses will tend to disabuse the reader of any such notion. The evils of the institution were such as perhaps may be inalienable from the institution itself. They were those which result from the inexperience of women in matters of secular business, and from the mark which the weakness of their sex naturally presents to the unscrupulous and aggressive. Their very worst features were ordinarily associated with that petty tyranny and love of dominion which some individuals, when placed in a position to exercise such powers, are unable entirely to forego ; when, however, we have admitted as much as this, which is common to all times, places, and institutions, we have admitted all. The atrocities which the moderns are fond of charging on those societies were of the most unfrequent occurrence. That they happened occasionally is possible, but that they were the ordinary character and condition of the system is altogether opposed to fact. There cannot be any reasonable doubt of the truth of this assertion. For, be it remembered, no attempt was made to conceal such delinquencies whenever they were perceived to exist by the vigilant eyes around. The episcopal registers contain minute information of the circumstances of the diocese of every imaginable kind, and any idea of suppression of the truth was never in the remotest degree entertained. Accordingly, such researches as the present furnish us with both positive and negative argument—positive of the presence, and negative of the absence, whether of good or of evil. Hence, if no mention be made of irregularities, we may fairly conclude that they were not in existence. The only way of arriving at correct conclusions, and indeed the only honest mode

of conducting the investigations which may lead to them, is that of patient and careful study of the original records, wherein alone is exhibited an undistorted reflex of the actual original. This is our duty, in agreement with every dictate of that honour and impartial love of truth which a research of such a nature demands. Modern notions are nothing to us. The memorials of contemporary ages can alone fill up for us the picture, and present us with the veritable lines of a living likeness. The character which it portrays is at length, I am happy to think, receiving more and more of the homage which is its due—the character of those who forgave men their faults, and tried to expiate them in their place—gentle, feeble beings who had the wretchedness of those who are punished, and the smile of those who are rewarded. . . . It is with a solemn sense of responsibility that I offer such a judgment, and feel as deeply that in these pleasant labours, illustrative of the working of the Divine Hand in the visible government of Holy Church, I am not only contributing to one of the fairest fields of secular literature, but, what is even, and far, better, I am aiding the extension of sacred knowledge, and the right interpretation of holy endeavour, and the reverent application of the Providence of God.” This is invaluable testimony—of inappreciable worth to our humble effort to vindicate from calumnies so lamentably enduring the sacred homes of England’s ancient faith. In fact, Mr. Hugo’s researches, and the sentiments in which their results are expressed, present a fine illustration of the power over a noble mind of simple truths so long denied. There is something chivalrous in a man holding Mr. Hugo’s position in the Anglican Church to write such a book; but his

integrity would not permit fact to be misrepresented, even could the misrepresentation be for the interest of the Church of which he is a member.

In Mr. Hugo's investigation of the character of the sisterhood of Buckland (Somersetshire), he observes, "The tongue of scandal was dumb. The blameless sisterhood pursued its ways of peace, broken only by trifling and unfrequent interruptions, or terminated by the end that comes alike to all. We may be well assured that the house was one of those where, with all the religion, all the education of the age was encouraged, and where both religion and education yielded to the full the refined and refining influences. It was, doubtless, also a noted seminary for the daughters of the great neighbouring families, who were ever at home at Buckland, and learned from the sisters all the mental accomplishments which they possessed in after-life. Reading, writing, arithmetic, the art of embroidery, music, and French were the recognized course of study, while the preparation of perfumes, balsam, simples, and confectionary was among the more ordinary departments of the education afforded ; and we should wrong alike the teachers and the taught, if we regarded the result as unfavourable. The life of intellectuality and religious quiet had numberless charms ; and the pupil was frequently so pleased by the contrast between it and that with which she was brought in contact elsewhere, that instances were not wanting of the resignation of all those worldly advantages which high birth and powerful connexions could impart to their possessor, for the permanent abode, as sister or prioress, within the venerable and well-beloved walls of her early and holy home." This nunnery, which was founded by

Henry II., in 1180, had an hospital for women attached to it; and all wayfarers who applied received refreshments from a revolving cupboard, the recipient never seeing the face of any of his benefactors. The revenue, at the time of confiscation, was about 224*l.*, representing now some 4500*l.* The property was divided between Alexander Popham and William Halley.

Dr. Hugo takes the following eloquent review of the former and subsequent conditions of religion, state of the country, the minds of the people, and the final result of the sacrilegious revolution of the sixteenth century :—  
“ It is little, if at all to be wondered at, that after this wholesale robbery of ecclesiastical possessions, the fate of our parish churches themselves appeared to hang doubtfully in the balance; and still less, if possible, that the more seriously-minded men of the day hesitated to join a movement connected with the open violation of most sacred obligations, and associated with much that gave a shock to the ordinary instincts of religion. The more steadily such men examined the acts and the actors in the hideous tragedy, the more they could not fail to reprobate the one and to abhor and execrate the other. Turn whithersoever they would, fresh evidences of evil met their eyes. Those who recollect the former state of many a locality, with its house of religious brethren or sisters, the centre of all elevating influences, its safe asylum for the weak and unprotected, its never-ceasing offices of intercession, its ungrudging hospitality, and generous consideration to the sick, the sorrowful, and the poor; or with its chapel, and constantly officiating priest, oftentimes among the hills and the woods—in places remote and of difficult access, but whither the true Christianity of

those early days had mercifully followed the lowest, and, in modern times, least regarded of the sons of men ; its loving commemoration of ancient piety departed to the recompense of an eternal reward ; and then contrasted all this with the grasping and godless presence of the new master, and the total cessation of all those charities and consolations which the suppression brought immediately in its train, could not help reverting, with feelings of affectionate regret, to the days when the old system was in operation, and the blessings of its beneficent rule could be seen and appreciated on every side. The secularization, too, of things hitherto held sacred ; the common use of holy objects, with which had been associated the highest mysteries of our Faith—could have but the result of brutalizing and degrading the minds of those to whom such sights were offered. . . . With familiarity came the contempt which was but a form of practical atheism. And no long time elapsed before the natural effects of such a state were apparent far and wide. The troublesome reign of Elizabeth, and the unquiet rule of the First James, were as the hot drops which heralded the thunder-storm and the crash of elemental war. The overthrow of Church and State in the seventeenth century was the simple result of that shameless revolution of right and truth which the sixteenth century had so horribly and fearfully witnessed. The miscreants of the one age were the parents of those of the other. The main agent in the ordering of the ‘unruly wills and affections of sinful men’ had been weakened, and, so far as possible, eradicated from the popular mind. Irreligion took its place. The hardness of heart and contempt of God’s word and commandment, the ‘false doctrine,’ heresy, and schism of the

time were then, as they are ever, in close concord with ‘sedition, conspiracy, and rebellion.’ The fields of Edge Hill, Marston Moor, and Naseby, and the loathsome atrocities which followed, were but the working out of the ancient curse pronounced once for all on the spoilers of Glastonbury and Fountains, of Tintern and St. Alban’s, of Athelney and Taunton, of Mynchin and Buckland. The retrospect of such a history as that which is now ended will not, in the judgment of the writer, be inaptly presented—which, after it has dwelt on the many vicissitudes of a society thus attempted to be rescued from unmerited oblivion, and has pursued, step after step, the aggression against its peace, and the appropriation, sacrilegious and accursed, of its possessions—shall seek to draw the lesson which the narrator can suggest: to plead even yet for the expiation of the crime, so far as that is possible, by restitution and satisfaction; to remind its readers of that immutable law of the providence of God, that—‘with what things a man hath sinned, with the same also shall he be punished;’ and, if he needs a visible proof of the certainty of the declaration, to point to the state of the England of to-day as a commentary—accurate, indeed, how melancholy soever—on those incontrovertible words of holiness and truth.”

The reverend gentleman thus eloquently contemplates the results which would be produced on the social condition of the country by the dissemination of religious houses, especially of women, seeing their happy effects in the old days of Catholic England. He writes,—

“ Within the circuit of those grey enclosures (Buckland), on which, when I last beheld them, the expiring rays of the evening sun were feeding amid a silence and

repose that deepened every moment, was once a little world far in advance of the great one outside, where earnest, truthful, and loving hearts were prompting hands to do their best towards the solace and enlightenment of all around. If an occasional cloud passed over and darkened for a few moments the sky, it only made more conspicuous the brightness which was its ordinary atmosphere. There, human life went on accompanied by much which raised and glorified it almost above humanity. In purity and truth the owners lived, and in faith and patience they laboured. Most happily for us—and it is, indeed, one of the encouraging signs of the age—we are again beginning to think that woman is never greater, never nobler, never lovelier, than when employed in the Great Master's work, and aiding her sisters in the way to heaven. Mediaeval times had, in this point of view, an immense advantage over ourselves, which it is short-sighted and unworthy of us to overlook or disparage. Woman then found, in countless instances, that on which she might lavish the fondness of her boundless heart—that which she might love, without weakness, shame, or sin—that on which all her ardent nature might pour itself out in the self-sacrificing devotion and unhesitating affection of which God has so blessedly made her capable. The writer is one who is of opinion—and he fears not to avow it—that the importance of this influence on the world at large cannot be possibly overrated, and that much whereof we bitterly complain, and which is disgraceful to us as Christian men, would stand its best, perhaps its only, chance of removal by such gracious instrumentality. A whole world of devoted aid would thus be given to us, from which, in our pride and conceit, we

have too long turned away, and, it may be added, have obtained our reward in the misery and degradation of multitudes. With the revival of woman's employment in sacred things, we shall turn over a new leaf in our country's history, and our eyes will be gladdened with a joy that shall be blighted by no after sorrow, as they rest upon a fairer, a happier, and a holier page<sup>4</sup>."

Fuller admits that the abbots were "most admirable landlords. . . . Their yearly rent was in some instances imposed as an acknowledgment rather than as rent, merely to distinguish the tenant from the landlord. Their fines were also very light. . . . As for rent-beeves, sheep, fowls, &c., reserved in their leases, tenants both paid them the more easily, as producing on the same, and the more cheerfully, because at any time they might freely eat their full share thereof when repairing to their landlords' bountiful table; insomuch that long leases from abbeys were preferred by many before some tenures of freeholds, as less subject to taxes and troublesome attendance." "The hospitality of the abbeys," says Brewer, "was large, especially at Christmas time, when they kept the most bountiful houses. Whosoever brought with him the face of a man, brought with him a patent for his free welcome till he pleased to depart. This was the method: where he brake his fast, there he dined; where he dined, there he supped; where he supped, there he brake his fast next morning, and so on, in a circle—always provided that he secured a lodging for himself at night, abbeys having great halls and refectories, but few chambers and dormitories, save for such

<sup>4</sup> The "Mediæval Nunneries of the County of Somerset," by the Rev. Thomas Hugo, M.A., F.R.S.L., F.S.A.

of their own society.” In the nunneries there were so many rooms set apart for females who were “compelled by distress, bad weather, or other circumstances” to seek a lodging, that “no evil hand of man might injure them.” The Abbey of Ely was considered the most hospitable of any extant in England, and gave the “best living to its visitors.” Thorney entertained one thousand people for four days at Easter. Glastonbury “had the finest fowl and fruit within twenty miles of their abbey gate<sup>5</sup>.” This famous monastery was credited by tradition with having been the residence of St. Joseph of Arimathea, and was the site of the first Christian Church in England, about A.D. 60. The first congregation of monks, it is recorded, was brought together here by a disciple of St. Patrick, in 436. The Saxon King Ina built a church in the place about 708. The town and abbey were burnt in 1184, and in 1276 an earthquake caused great damage. So far the ancient chronicles. Willis and other writers describe Glastonbury as one of the most magnificent places in England. Its fields of roses and its teeming orchards were the admiration of all visitors. Its church, of exquisite architecture, was nearly as large as the Cathedral of Old St. Paul’s in London. The pious and the learned of various countries resorted thither to “watch and pray.” From the East there were learned visitors, both Jews and Turks—architects and scholars—for the fame of the fathers’ scholarship had extended to the bounds of the then known world. Irish abbots, pilgrims, and searchers after knowledge numerously visited Glastonbury, and St. Columbkille, so illustrious

<sup>5</sup> Thorndale’s “Memorials;” Fuller’s “Church Hist.” ed. by Dr. Brewer, vol. iii. pp. 337, 338.

in Ireland and Scotland, is said to have been buried there in 504. The frequent intercourse of British and Irish religions in the early ages proves the good understanding produced by the influence of a common religion, although, by a strange perversion of history, records, and traditions, the English and Irish Churches are said to have differed in many essentials. But these statements are propounded only by the ingenious inventors who have discovered the genuine Protestantism of St. Patrick. At Woburn Abbey the milk of fifty cows was given daily to the peasantry. An old tradition related that the children in that district "grew up strongly-built men and women from the large quantity of pure milk they received in childhood from the abbeys<sup>6</sup>." A book published by Baxter, in the reign of Charles II., makes an opposite statement, but it is the mere assertion of a prejudiced Puritan. Although the visitors and peasantry were well supplied with food, the rules of those houses were severe in "portioning out discipline and small doles of food to the brethren or sisterhood." Christmas and Easter were the only periods of the year at which there was any relaxation of the rules as to diet. At those festive seasons "every one within the walls of an abbey or convent received good cheer." But there were a few houses which remained rigidly severe in discipline at all seasons, "placing roast beef and fowl before their visitors, whilst their own diet consisted of vegetables, bread, and water. Nevertheless, they looked in good health, were cheerful, and happy." Some Protestant writers contend that the "profuse hospitality of the monastic houses led to vice and vagrancy; but this, like many

<sup>6</sup> Thorndale's "Memorials of Abbeys," Stephens, and Dugdale.

other statements, is not sustained by trustworthy evidence—not certainly by the records of the times, which should be considered the most reliable. Mr. Froude denies that the religious houses dispensed much hospitality to the people; and further, he avers of their inmates, “The vast majority of them were self-indulgent, profligate, worthless, and dissolute<sup>7</sup>.” The reader can make his decision between the statements of Mr. Froude and the Protestant authorities and State Papers quoted throughout this work.

Of all the counties in England, Gloucestershire had the largest number of religious houses, presided over by four mitred abbots, and Westmoreland had the smallest amount of any county in the realm; and it is a noteworthy fact that in the reign of Henry VII. Westmoreland had a large number of people in an indigent condition, also a “goodly number of thieves and vagabonds,” whilst in Gloucestershire vagrants and thieves were scarcely known, and the peasantry—men and women—were either located on small farms, or working for the abbeys and convents. They were not, therefore, “eating the bread of laziness, vagrancy, or vice<sup>8</sup>.”

When such men as John Bale, himself a prominent Reformer in Edward’s reign, and a *protégé* of Cranmer and Northumberland, made a protest against the spoliation of the monastic libraries, the conduct of the Reformers must be difficult to describe.

“Some libraries were used to *clean candlesticks*; some to *rub boots*; some were sold to grocers and soap-boilers; and large quantities were sent over the

<sup>7</sup> Froude’s “History of England” (vol. ii. p. 411).

<sup>8</sup> Stephens’ “Monastic Houses;” Dugdale’s “Monasticon.”

sea—whole shipfuls, to the great wonder of foreign nations. Yea, the universities of this realm are not all clear in this detestable fact—but cursed be that belly that seeketh to be fed with such ungodly gains, and so deeply showeth his natural depravity! I know a man who bought the contents of two noble libraries *for forty shillings—a shame be it spoken!* *He used the said books, instead of grey paper, for ten years, and yet he had sufficient for many more years to come.* . . . . What can bring our nation more to shame and rebuke than to have it told abroad that we are despisers of learning? I judge this to be true, and utter it with heaviness, that neither the Britons—under the Romans and Saxons, nor yet the English people under the Danes and Normans, had ever such damage of their learned monuments as we have seen in our time. Our posterity may well curse this wicked fact of our age; this lamentable destruction of England's most noble antiquities.” Bale's evidence becomes more important from the fact that he was an eye-witness of this barbarous immolation of literature, and, as one of the most eminent scholars and antiquaries of his time, he mourned over the conduct of his co-religionists. “What soul,” writes Thomas Fuller, “can be so frozen as not to melt into anger hereat? What heart having the least spark of ingenuity is not hot at this indignity offered to literature? . . . Beautiful Bibles, rare Fathers, the life-long labours of scholars, ancient histories, diaries, records of great interest, monuiments of mathematics—*every book with a cross was condemned, and all massacred together.*” Why this condemnation of the cross? Why stigmatize the emblem of man's redemption? Did these Reformer Vandals, in casting off the

old religion, abandon their belief in Christ? These questions inevitably present themselves when we behold the hatred which Puritanic Protestantism has exhibited to the symbol of the great Atonement. Alas! the belief of such men seems to consist only in hatred of the faith of others!

Again we state, there is a great mistake as to the payment of pensions to the nuns. Some were promised 4*l.* a year, others 8*l.*; a third class were "told to get husbands, and become mothers." The pensions were paid but in a few instances, although historians have informed us that the "royal word was fulfilled to all monks and nuns who feared God and honoured the King." There are letters and diaries extant to prove the destitution and misery to which the vast body of the nuns were reduced. A large number of them lived to an old age, and "were persecuted and insulted by the Elizabethan bishops, who made themselves remarkable in hunting down those ladies who did so much to make good wives and daughters of their pupils<sup>9</sup>."

Isabel Sackville was a prominent personage amongst the lady prioresses of England. She was the last prioress of Clerkenwell—a house which had won great fame amongst the sisterhoods of London. She died in the twelfth year of Elizabeth's reign, at the age of ninety-one. Owing to her relationship with the noble houses of Dorset and Buckhurst, some provision was made for her old age, out of which she supported three of her less fortunate sisters of Clerkenwell Priory, namely, Mary Lee, aged seventy-nine years, Ann Rivers, ninety-two, and Theresa Shaxton, aged eighty-eight.

<sup>9</sup> Fuller's "Church Hist.;" Thorndale's "Memorials."

“Isabel Sackville,” says Thorndale, “was a nun in Clerkenwell Priory in the days of Henry VII. ; she was then young, beautiful, and devoted in her study of cures for ailing children.” Fuller relates that no convent in England kept a more careful record of their history than that of Clerkenwell ; but we find from other sources, and some MS. still preserved, that the great majority of the couvents were remarkable for the minuteness with which they chronicled every incident connected with the “order, household arrangements, visitors,” and they seem also to have had amongst them many learned women. Here is a list of the four and twenty ladies who filled the office of prioress in direct succession, from its foundation to its dissolution :—

1. Ceciliana. 2. Amegrd. 3. Haweisia. 4. Cleonora.  
5. Alisia. 6. Cecilia. 7. Margery Whatville. 8. Isabell. 9. Alice Oxeney. 10. Annice Marcy. 11. Denys Bras. 12. Margery Bray. 13. Joan Lewknor.  
14. Joan Fulham. 15. Katherine Braybroke. 16. Lucy Attewood. 17. Joan Viene. 18. Margaret Bakewell. 19. Isabel Wentworth. 20. Margaret Bull. 21. Agnes de Clifford. 22. Katherine Green.  
23. Isabel Hussey. 24. Isabel Sackville<sup>1</sup>.

Elizabeth Woodville, before her marriage with Edward IV., retired to Clerkenwell Convent for three days’ devotion ; and Katherine of Arragon, before her espousal with Henry VIII., repaired to the same convent for a similar religious purpose.

In the thirty-fourth year of Queen Elizabeth’s reign Rose Herbert, one of the nuns of Godstowe, died in the neighbourhood of Hackney. She was ninety-six years of age, and had been in a state of destitution for the last

<sup>1</sup> MSS. in the Cotton Library ; Fuller, Brewer, and Collier.

fifteen years of her life. This venerable lady, it is said, was personally acquainted with Queen Anna Boleyn, Lord Cromwell, and Archbishop Cranmer. About the same period another of the Godstowe community, Theresa Whyte, died at St. Alban's, in the eighty-ninth year of her age, in poverty, and nearly paralyzed for want of warm clothing. “In Elizabeth's reign the people in many parts of England seem to have lost all sympathy for their old cloistered benefactresses, for those poor ladies became an object of scorn, and the vilest reproaches were cast on them, in their declining years; but it could scarcely be otherwise when such men as Parkhurst, Jewell, and Sandys—all prelates of the new learning—set so discreditable an example to the fanatical and ignorant. . . . The nuns were treated far worse than the monks. They were expelled from their lawful homes, and in many instances thrown upon the bleak highways, to wander along the ditches and the hedges, proclaiming by their pale, emaciated faces and tattered garments the fact that humanity, equity, or chivalry, were not amongst the virtues of the lay and clerical apostles of the Reformation<sup>2</sup>.”

The question has often been asked, “What became of the monks after the confiscation of the religious houses?” We answer, Many were hanged, hundreds perished in prison, or died from hunger; but we find, by research in old Irish chronicles, and the contemporary State Papers of the sister kingdom, that in a space of fourteen years nearly twelve hundred English monks landed at different parts of Ireland in various disguises. In Connaught a large number found a reception worthy the proverbial hospitality of the Celt

<sup>2</sup> The “Monastic Houses of England,” p. 34.

from the O'Conors, the De Burgos, the O'Kellies, the O'Flaherties, the O'Donnellans, the O'Shaughnessies<sup>3</sup>, the Lynches, the Bodkins, the Keoghs, and other ancient families of that faithfully Catholic province. In Ulster the exiles were received with eager kindness by the O'Neills, O'Donnells, O'Dogherties, and Maguires. In Munster and Leinster (even with the leading Catholics of the Pale) many found refuge and generous support; and with such fidelity was their secret guarded, that the authorities never could discover the asylum of any, though aware of their presence in the island. It is still a tradition amongst the Irish how rapidly these monks learned the Gaelic tongue, and how fervently they preached against Henry's sacrilegious assumption of supremacy, as they did afterwards, in peril and privation, against the inroads of the Reformation. In the reign of Elizabeth they went throughout the country instructing the people, strengthening their faith, and exposing the characters of the leading Reformers. This zeal was manifested in the face of death, for they were literally hunted like wolves; but neither the famine nor the death which befell many discouraged the survivors. In the reign of Elizabeth the military deputies shot them down, we are assured, like "carrion crows:" until, finally, their numbers faded away, from bullet, steel, nakedness, and hunger, and but few remained to die out among the natives of the remote glens or other retreats of a perse-

<sup>3</sup> Sir Denis O'Shaughnessy had inscribed on the gates of his castle, in the county Clare, these words:—"Let no honest man who is dry or hungry pass this way." With the English Abbots the same kind, fraternal sentiment was represented by a monk standing at the gate at the hour of dinner with a white wand in hand as a signal of welcome to the wayfarer.

cuted people. The history of those plundered monks of England is amongst the saddest, yet grandest records of the olden creed. Father Latchett, of Glastonbury, was an illustrious member of these exiled martyrs. He fled to Ireland during the deputyship of Lord Sussex. He was imprisoned for twelve years, and lashed and tortured twenty times; finally escaping, he continued for thirty years to preach against the Reformation; and ultimately died, in his wild retreat in the Galtee mountains, at the patriarchal age of 110<sup>4</sup>, having concluded a life of unparalleled dangers, sufferings, and trials, but of unwavering fidelity, fortitude, and virtue. Were it deemed worth while to gather amongst the Irish-speaking natives of South Munster the traditions and ballads of their bards, memorials would be found of the faith, devotion, and fearlessness of the good English *soggarths* (priests). But the race of the bards has long disappeared, and even tradition is becoming fainter as the population extends, just as a cloud becomes thinner from expansion.

Saunders the historian, against whose history so much has been alleged, but so little proved, was a zealous English priest who took refuge in Ireland, but, having been hunted hither and thither by the authorities, he was at length found dead in a field near Kinsale, county Cork. Thus perished, of hunger and suffering, with his breviary by his side, the learned historian of the Reformation, whose work would

<sup>4</sup> The Rev. Paul O'Dempsey's "Accompte of the Noble English Fryers," a little book long out of print. A copy of it was in the possession of the author's family for more than a century. O'Dempsey was a Franciscan priest, and died in the reign of James the First, having witnessed the desolating wars of Mountjoy, and the famine and cannibalism caused in Ireland by the merciless fury of Elizabeth.

have been in higher repute if he had not imparted to its statements the *ἀκάμετον πῦρ* (unquenchable fire) of his own fervid enthusiasm, of his own burning anger at the injustice, hypocrisy, guilt, and desolation around him.

The reigns of Edward the Sixth and of Elizabeth present the first occasions for contrasting the England of monkish times with the England of the Reformed dispensation. The English yeoman and peasant cease to be what Chief Justice Fortescue presents them to posterity as in the latter days of the Plantagenets: “Every inhabitant is at his liberty fully to use and enjoy whatever his farm produceth, the fruits of the earth, the increase of his flock, and the like. All the improvements he makes, whether by his own proper industry, or of those he retains in his service, are his own, to use and to enjoy, without the let, interruption, or denial of any. If he be in any wise injured or oppressed, he shall have his amends and satisfactions against the party offending. Hence it is that the inhabitants are rich in gold, silver, and in all the necessaries and conveniences of life. They drink no water, unless at certain times, upon a religious score, and by way of doing penance. They are fed, in great abundance, with all sorts of flesh and fish, of which they have plenty every where; they are clothed throughout in good woollens; their bedding and other furniture in their houses are of wool, and that in great store. They are also well provided with all sorts of household goods and necessary implements for husbandry. Every one, according to his rank, hath all things which conduce to make life easy and happy.” The evidence on this subject multiplies. Philip de Comines, the most en-

lightened observer of his day, who had visited the richest countries of continental Europe, and noted carefully their condition, declared England—in the time of the monasteries too—to be the best governed kingdom he had seen. He draws a glowing picture of the hospitality of the secular clergy and the monastic Fathers to strangers; their consideration for literature and men of letters; the frank generosity and manly kindness of the people; and, above all, the virtue and beauty of the women, their innocence and their unaffected truth.

The description furnished by Lord Borlase of his Irish victims, at a later period, may with truth be applied to the English nation at the dawn of the Reformation: “They were peaceable and harmless; affable to strangers, and to all; and pious and good, whilst they *retained* the religion of their forefathers.” Things were sadly changed in England at the accession of the last of the Tudors. In one of her tours through the kingdom Elizabeth, lifting up her hands, exclaimed, “*Pauper ubique jacet!*” Here is a Protestant witness whose testimony is more trustworthy than the asseverations of a legion of “dark-ages” chroniclers. In the preface to his learned work, the “*Mediaeval Nunneries*,” the Rev. Mr. Hugo says, “The study of the records of mediaeval times has been one of the happiest occupations of a large part of my life; and the longer I am employed, and the deeper I proceed in the examination of the ages which they illustrate, the more profound is my respect, and the more cordial is my admiration of their manifold excellences.” Such is the opinion of a Protestant divine, whose research, learning, and candour have won him the thankful esteem of innumerable readers.

The writers who so flippantly treat of the “dark ages,” and of the benighted epoch of Popery, have proved their sad unfitness for a task whose results have been books replete with falsehoods to mislead our English youth. The qualification of these men is of a duplex character—bringing forth untruth, either from ignorance or from a love of falsehood. As it is far less wicked to bear false witness from ignorance than with knowledge, let us hope such writers have entered the field of letters as devoid of research as their readers; but, if consciously they bear untrue testimony, they deserve our execration. It is difficult to say which are the worst—those who write to satisfy their own malign bigotry, or those who do so in order to pander to that of others. The highest beatitude of which such men are capable would be the negative virtue of silence. Have the writers of those historic romances to which we allude—references by men in the dark to the “dark ages”—never compared the condition and the mind of the English yeoman and peasant in the days of Chancellor Fortescue (in Popish times), and those which characterized them in the “golden age of good Queen Bess,” with all the lights of the Reformation newly shed upon the land? “Pauperism every where abounds” was the ejaculation of the Tudor lioness. Good old Fortescue was able to say of the English, in his nervous Latin, “A people having all things which conduce to make life easy and happy.” *Utrum horum mavis accipe, oh, candid reader!*

Roger Ascham, himself a zealous Reformer, said, in 1547, “The life now lived by many is not life, but misery.”

The reader must be made aware that the original “report” upon the religious houses of England was

destroyed in the reign either of Henry or Queen Mary. The statements, therefore, upon which Foxe, Burnet, Speed, Oldmixon, Brady, Rapin, Strype, Hume, Sharon Turner, Froude, &c., mainly base their representations of the “crimes of the monastic houses” are the loose, unconnected, and uncertified letters of the inquisitors to Lord Cromwell—missives which were “considered, altered, and shaped for the report to be presented to the King.” The letters of Layton are accepted as genuine, whereas they may have been merely tentative falsehoods, and are not proved to have been adopted, in any measure, for Cromwell’s report. But all the above-mentioned writers have kept their readers in the dark as to the ineffably infamous character of Layton and the disrepute of his co-inquisitors. Layton was accompanied in his tour of inquisition by several spendthrift squires, who assisted in making reports to Lord Cromwell; and we need not the pen of a Fielding to enable us to imagine the character of a profligate squire of that age. On the other hand, the documents in question have been thoroughly sifted by such truthful Protestant authorities as Fuller, the Camden Papers, Brewer, Hook, Blunt, and Hugo, who generally regard the character of the inquisitors, and the motives for their report, as justly depriving those letters of any credence. They bear the impress of prepared and predetermined falsehood—or, as Mr. Blunt mildly designates them, “cut-and-dry reports.” A number of Layton’s “returns” to Lord Cromwell are now among the Cottonian MSS., and more of them have been printed in Sir Henry Ellis’s letters. We have also informed the reader (page 37) that private reports have, within the last seven years, been found which so disagreed in their statements

with those which were desired by Lord Cromwell that the reporters were quickly substituted by more facile instruments.

The reader has seen what manner of men were the inquisitors into the religious houses: let us now regard the historian whose evidence has been hitherto accepted as proof against the monastic institutions of England. Perhaps the most suitable text to the issue here raised is to be found in the words of Dr. Maitland: "*The question of authorities is a very grave one indeed.*"

The Protestant writers who bear testimony to the untruthful character of Burnet, as a historian, are some of the most eminent of his own and subsequent times. Henry Wharton (1693) made a most damaging exposure of the "suppression, colouring, and falsifying of facts" by Dr. Burnet. Swift and Arbuthnot have questioned his veracity generally, and attribute unworthy motives to him. Indeed, Swift affirms that, notwithstanding his "affected zeal for liberty, his first work was in defence of arbitrary power." Jacob Lawson, a Puritan contemporary, says, "Gilbert Burnet was a man who blew hot and cold for money, or what he considered as good—rich patrons. It is unfortunate that a history on such an important question as the Reformation should have been written by a man like Gilbert Burnet." Burnet's correspondence with Middleton on "obedience and loyalty to the throne," whilst at the same moment plotting against his lawful Sovereign, is another of the many illustrations of Lawson's saying, "Blowing hot and cold." Sir John Dalrymple observes, "I have never tried Burnet's facts by the tests of dates and original papers without finding them wrong." Dr. Johnson, who was wont to

scan men and motives with the comprehensive eye of a philosopher, sarcastically remarked that Burnet was “a man who set his watch by a certain clock, and did not care whether that clock were right or wrong.” Bevil Higginson’s “Historical and Critical Remarks” set the seal of condemnation on Burnet’s character for truth in any form. Even David Hume, his own countryman, “considers him sometimes *mistaken* as to facts.” Nevertheless, Hume has published his “facts” as accurate statements. Miss Strickland generalizes Burnet’s character as that of “*a notoriously false witness.*” Sir Walter Scott states that Burnet’s “opinions were often hastily adopted, and sometimes awkwardly retracted; and that his patrons were frequently changed.” Sir Walter censures his work on the legality of “Divorce from a Wife on the ground of Barrenness,” but is silent as to the motives which suggested that work. Dryden and some of his contemporaries charge Burnet with availing himself of “past confidence to criminate former patrons.” There is, however, one transaction connected with Dr. Burnet’s career which presents the master-key to his character. When the Ministry of Charles II. had failed in their schemes to set aside the King’s lawful wife, Katherine of Braganza, they employed the royal chaplain (Burnet), who preached before the “King and his harem” every Sunday, to write a book setting forth the Queen’s “barrenness as a good cause for a divorce.” The “royal chaplain” hesitated not to recur to matters which preceded the Mosaic dispensation; and sought to renew the tenets of a Hebrew economy which the gathering intelligence of the Jews had almost eschewed before the coming of the Redeemer. This “*Solution of Conscience,*” as the

writer styled it, created a common feeling of contempt for Dr. Burnet at every Court in Europe; and, whatever goodness or virtue that profligate age left in England, unanimously denounced the author of the vile principles thus propounded by a future bishop for his King. Burnet's excuse was, that the "Solution of Conscience" "was the honest result of searching the *Scriptures on the subject.*" "It is needless," writes Miss Strickland, with the natural indignation of a virtuous mind, "to comment on the base hypocrisy of affecting to search the *Scriptures* for an excuse of vice. These polluted shafts were aimed at the innocent Queen at the suggestion, it is presumed, of Buckingham and Lauderdale<sup>5</sup>. It was expected that they would have obtained the reward of a rich bishopric<sup>6</sup> for the writer: but Charles despised the adviser and spurned the advice; and when Gilbert Burnet, some years subsequently, having joined the opponents of the Court in consequence of his being deprived of his office in the Chapel Royal, wrote a remonstrance to the King on his immoral way of life, Charles treated him with the most cutting contempt<sup>7</sup>, regarding him as something like Satan in the proverb.

But it is his "History of the Reformation" which

<sup>5</sup> In the notes of Sir Walter Scott's "Life and Works of Dryden" (vol. ix.) the reader will find a narrative as to the circumstances under which Burnet betrayed the secrets of his patron, the Duke of Lauderdale, to the House of Commons in 1675. Miss Strickland has also chronicled minute particulars of the part Burnet enacted against James II. and his family.

<sup>6</sup> Burnet was appointed Bishop of Salisbury by William III.—a small reward for the infamous treason and duplicity which he had practised in order to promote his patron's interests.

<sup>7</sup> Miss Strickland's "Queens of England" (2nd edition), vol. v. p. 588.

forms the great bill of indictment brought by Truth against the memory of Gilbert Burnet. His “History of his own Times” is amusing, well-written, and more or less false ; but his “History of the Reformation” must needs have been a perversion of truth and honour to provoke the thanks of the corrupt Parliament of the Second Charles. The first part was published in 1681-1682, to aid in setting aside the succession of the Duke of York ; and the second was not published until thirty-three years afterwards (1715), when the first Pretender’s insurrection caused the persecutions against the Catholics to be resumed with renewed severity. The two portions of the “History of the Reformation” were written for special epochs, and with a special purpose. The unjust possessors of the confiscated property of the Church and the poor apprehended that they might have to account, if James were fixed firmly on the throne—hence the historic falsehoods of Burnet and others ; hence the Whig conspiracy and rebellion of 1688. Burnet’s “authorities” for his statements were the letters of the execrable inquisitors ; and, in putting forth their proved calumnies for truth, Burnet, in the almost sacred character of historian, has done a grievous wrong to posterity and to the cause of truth. It is but fair, however, even to Foxe and Burnet, to admit that the later editions of their works have been “dressed” for the market, as the subsequent enterprise of literary fraud. Let us see the character of this Burnet, First Chaplain to Charles and his “oda,” writer of a pamphlet in favour of polygamy and inciting the King to get rid of his injured Queen on account of her barrenness. Myriads of readers who imagine that Burnet was, as he has been

recently designated, “the good bishop,” the “honest prelate,” would not credit that he wrote the detestable “Solution of Conscience,” any more than those who believe he was a friend of the people would suppose that he was the main promoter of the Septennial Act, which, by passing at the time it did, rooted the national debt on the shoulders of England. But look at the actions of Burnet, and then weigh the worth of his allegations, the extent of his trustworthiness: the friend and enemy of the high-minded Clarendon and his family, just as “fortune smiled or frowned upon them;” the “Royal Chaplain” who descended to accept presents from such women as Lady Castlemaine, the Duchess of Portsmouth, and Nell Gwynne; the political agent and spy of Shaftesbury, of Lauderdale, of Danby, of Buckingham, of Tenison, whilst at the same time “under personal obligations” to the Duke of York and his confiding wife, Anne Hyde; the co-conspirator of the Prince of Orange and his wife, of the Princess Anne, and the treacherous Churchill; and, later still, the secret correspondent of Lord Sunderland, the basest of the base men of his age—surely a history of the Reformation by such a man cannot be received without grave suspicions of the motives which influenced its author. He had great interests to subserve—his own and others—how could a history in which politics and religion are so closely blended, written by such a man, be unhesitatingly accepted? See the history—behold the man: a prelate the most time-serving that ever shamed a mitre; a man who (it could scarcely be reckoned unfair to say) never performed an action without an interested motive, nor wrote a line without some indirect, if not proximate, regard to his never-

forgotten self. Yet, on the foundation laid by this episcopal Mendez Pinto, one or more of our noted writers have raised their most brilliant historical structures—palaces of Aladdin, to vanish in a moment at the command of the Genius of Truth. Thus we show Burnet to be unworthy of belief from his own personal character. But, to add to this, his “authorities” had no character at all<sup>8</sup>.

#### ANNE OF CLEVES.

THE history of Anne of Cleves, the first Protestant Queen of England, is brief. There can be little doubt that this German Princess was chosen by Cranmer and Cromwell as a wife for the King on account of the zeal displayed by her father, mother, and brother for the Reformation<sup>9</sup>. Upon her arrival in England, she was at first received with favour by some of the future Reformers, whilst the old Catholic party stood aloof; and the populace indulged in the idle curiosity to behold “the big fat woman who did not look like a queen.” “When Henry saw his bride-elect,” says Bryan, “he was disappointed, but knew how to control

<sup>8</sup> Bishop Burnet died in 1715, and was buried in the old church of St. James's, Clerkenwell. In 1788 the Bishop's corpse was found in a leaden coffin which had become much decayed, but the skull and some of the hair were visible.

<sup>9</sup> The mother of Anne of Cleves was distinguished for her hatred of Catholicity; yet in that hostility may have been mingled some elements of patriotism, for Charles the Fifth was the oppressor of the Low Countries at the same time that he was regarded as the head of European Catholic sovereigns. Watton, the English Ambassador, wrote to Henry the Eighth, stating that she “died out of her wits for spite and anger” at the Emperor's successes in South Germany.

his feelings; for two nights he did not sleep, and walked his chamber many times; he was puzzled how to act; he waited, however, until he had time for a long discourse with the Archbishop of Canterbury. Every thing went contrary: the Archbishop had a severe cold, and was not able to appear until the morning of the marriage. The Princess won't answer at all; but I hear she will disappoint some people by her readiness to hear the Latin Mass; she will do every thing to please our good and blessed King. He is taking to the Mass very much again. What will the Archbishop do? Why, whatever he is ordered, I suppose. The people who proposed the match must suffer." But a few days had elapsed when the marriage was performed by Archbishop Cranmer. High mass was first celebrated by the Archbishop, assisted by "many priests." "Lord Cromwell was amongst those present, and," writes Bryan, "he edified the King by his piety." Roland Lee says, "Our blessed King was in a religious turn of mind: God keep him so. He received Holy Communion. He looked annoyed at every thing, and seems more like a widower at the grave of his better-half than a bridegroom. Somebody will suffer in the skin and hide for giving him this greasy-faced Jack for a wife<sup>1</sup>." Few about the Court better understood the character of Henry than Roland Lee.

Hall, who was present at the wedding, describes Henry's costume: "His Grace," the King, "was apparelled in a gown of cloth of gold, raised with great

<sup>1</sup> "Greasy-faced Jack" was a nick-name given to the Princess by Lady Rochford.

flowers of silver, and furred with black jernest<sup>2</sup>; his coat, crimson satin embroidered with great diamonds; and a rich collar about his neck.” The bride was dressed in a vulgar Dutch costume, which made her appearance disagreeable; she “looked demure, sad, and sour”—very unlike her fair predecessor, “My May-flower,” as Henry called Jane Seymour.

The married life of Anne of Cleves was rendered more disagreeable as the King had encouraged the ladies of the Court to mimic and ridicule her. Lady Rochford was foremost amongst those who insulted and derided the Queen; the Duke of Suffolk and Sir Francis Bryan also amused the King by their gross jests upon her personal appearance. The Archbishop of Canterbury “regretted what an inferior woman the new Queen was; that she was not in any way suited to be the wife of such a magnificent man, and a King so truly good and great; she could not be compared with the lovely Queen Jane of blessed memory<sup>3</sup>.” These observations, whispered to the Duke of Suffolk, were certain to reach the royal ear. At this time Suffolk was the most mischievous of the King’s “domestic advisers, and, having been reared from boyhood as a companion to Henry, exercised an influence as to his marriages and amours which no other man could do; and, like Sir Francis Bryan, he suggested whatever he thought most agreeable to his master’s will.” Miss Strickland describes Suffolk as “the ready tool of the King in all his matrimonial tyrannies;” indeed, it may be added

<sup>2</sup> The wedding took place on the 6th January; the day was intensely cold.

<sup>3</sup> Letter of Sir Francis Bryan to Roger Ascham “concerning things about Court.”

that the courtiers of the time disgraced their station by the conduct they pursued towards the harmless and unoffending Anne of Cleves.

In a few months the Queen was set aside, and the King again had recourse to his “spiritual adviser.” One of the questions raised on the divorce of Anne of Cleves was that her father “contracted her in marriage to the Duke of Lorraine.” When the contract took place Anne of Cleves was only twelve years old; but the betrothal was afterwards set aside with the consent of both parties. Henry’s conscience was becoming more sensitive as he proceeded, for he in this instance pleaded that Anne could not lawfully become his wife; and the Archbishop of Canterbury of course agreed in his Sovereign’s opinion. It detracts, however, very much from an honest belief in Henry’s sincerity, when it is remembered that these scruples only arose on the eve of a new bridal. The Convocation of Canterbury adopted the views of the divorce submitted to them by Archbishop Cranmer, and they declared by a large majority, that “the marriage of Anne of Cleves with the King was null and void.” The Archbishop of Canterbury then, fortified by the concurrence of Convocation, pronounced judgment, dissolving the marriage. An Act of Parliament followed, decreeing that “all the proceedings of the Convocation and Archbishop Cranmer were according to law and justice, that his Highness the King was then at liberty to marry any other maiden he pleased; and the said Anne of Cleves could marry any man who asked her to enter wedlock<sup>4</sup>.”

The Archbishop of Canterbury having divorced Anne

<sup>4</sup> Lord Herbert’s Life of Henry VIII. ; Hume, vol. iii. ; Archbishops of Canterbury, vol. vii.

of Cleves from her husband, King Henry, “according to the statutes of the realm and *the laws of God*,” settled 3,000*l.* a year upon her, with the title of the “King’s sister.” Previous to this settlement, and the divorce, a document was submitted to her by Dr. Cranmer and Lord Cromwell to sign, which declared that her marriage with the King had never been consummated, and that she agreed to be divorced from his Highness. She did not know what the paper contained, as she could read no language but Plats-Deutsch, or Flemish; she was, however, compelled to sign the document in question; and it was subsequently used by Archbishop Cranmer as “one of the reasons” for the divorce of Anne. The Archbishop had also at the very same time in his possession a document containing the King’s “abominable reasons for a divorce, which completely contradicted the paper which his lawful wife had been compelled to sign, not knowing what it contained.”

Cranmer’s possession of the execrable letter of Henry, whilst causing Anne to sign this paper, is merely an additional proof of his falsehood, indecency, and dishonour. We hazard no criticism upon that production, but copy the opinion of Dean Hook. “If any one,” he writes, “were in duty bound to expose the character of Henry VIII., an investigation of this case would prove him to be devoid of the common feelings of a gentleman, a Christian, a man. Perhaps there is not in historical literature a viler document than that in which he assigned his reasons for seeking a divorce. He cared not what he did or said, if only he could carry his object.” In what estimation

<sup>5</sup> Archbishops of Canterbury, vol. vii.

could Henry have held Cranmer—an archbishop, too—that he dared to make him his confidant in the secrets of his brutal licentiousness? Of all the divorces which Cranmer engaged in at the desire of his changeful and profligate master, this one of Anne of Cleves was by far the worst. No law, spiritual or temporal, could be pleaded in its favour; and the iniquitous facility with which it was accomplished must have satisfied Henry that the last place from which he need fear reproof in his headlong career of crime was the archiepiscopal throne of Canterbury.

When Henry married Catherine Howard, which he did without giving the ink on the divorce papers much time to dry—he had the unmanly indelicacy to introduce his “little bride” to his “late wife;” and though Anne of Cleves was spiritless enough to “give them a good reception,” that fact forms no excuse for Henry. Anne, however, deemed herself fortunate that divorce had become an institution, for when in a short time after, the “little bride” was sent to the scaffold, the divorced Queen, on hearing of the butchery, exclaimed, “Good Heaven, what an escape I had!”

Anne of Cleves soon became reconciled to her settlement. She resided at Richmond, and occasionally at Chelsea, where she won much respect from the people. She took no part in the intrigues of the contending parties of the time; but never forgave Cranmer, and expressed her horror of his general conduct. When he was sent to the Tower in Mary’s reign, she observed that he should have been sent there long before. She was much esteemed by Queen Mary and her husband Philip, and also by the Princess Elizabeth and Cardinal Pole. After a short time the “good

living of old England" made her very contented, and she was wont to remark joyously, "There is no place like this England for fedin righte well." The flattering portrait of Anne furnished by Hans Holbein differed much from the original. A contemporary has been so ungallant as to state that she was tall, had coarse features, "ugly hands and feet, a large mouth, and bad teeth; figure ill-proportioned; a vulgar appearance, and ungraceful manners." "She had none of those arts or qualifications" (we are further assured) "which might have subdued the antipathy of so 'choiceful' a husband as Henry." He spoke English, Latin, French, Italian, and Spanish; she knew no other language than her own—an "involved Walloon:" he was passionately fond of music; she could neither play nor sing. Henry wished his Queen to excel in the different amusements of his court, but the "sullen, silent, and ignorant Anne of Cleves" possessed no other acquirements than merely to read and write, and sew with her needles. All the arts of Cromwell could not reconcile a man like Henry Tudor to such a companion.

Amongst the wedding gifts given by Henry to Anne of Cleves was a ring, on which was inscribed "God send me well to kepe." With unprincely meanness when Cranmer had declared him "unmarried," he ordered Anne to return all the wedding presents he had made her. The ring in question had been previously presented to Anna Boleyn.

Some two years before her death Anne of Cleves embraced the Catholic religion, for which she was fiercely denounced by the Reformers. She died in July, 1557, at Chelsea, and was buried in Westminster Abbey, near the grave of the unfortunate Anne of Warwick, Queen of

Richard the Third<sup>6</sup>. She had an impressive funeral; High Mass sung by Bonner, Bishop of London; a sermon by the Lord Abbot Feckenham; thirty monks and forty seculars attended the ceremonies, together with a large number of the inhabitants of London, who had been for years the recipients of her bounty<sup>7</sup>. Hollingshead describes Anne of Cleves as a "lady of right commendable regard, courteous and gentle, a good housekeeper, and very bountiful to her servants and retainers." Her beneficent spirit was wholly occupied in deeds of mercy, caring for the happiness of her maidens and the orphans whom she supported and lodged. She lived on friendly terms with the Princesses Mary and Elizabeth and had also the good fortune to command the respect of the contending factions of her time.

## MINOR NOTABILITIES.

It may be considered sufficient to summarize here a few of the less prominent characters of Henry's reign. It has been alleged that Edward Fox, Bishop of Hertford, was a Reformer; but there is no foundation for the statement. Dodd remarks that Fox's opinions concerning the King's supremacy, and his book against the See of Rome, do not prove that he adopted the principles of the Reformers. "Catholics,"

<sup>6</sup> Miss Strickland's "Queens of England," vol. ii. p. 374, opens with an interesting memoir of this beautiful and ill-fated princess. "No memorial now marks," writes Miss Strickland, "the spot where the broken heart of the hapless Anne of Warwick found rest from as much sorrow as could possibly be crowded into the short span of thirty-one years."

<sup>7</sup> In "Excerpta Historica" is to be seen a quaint description of the ceremonial observed at the funeral of Anne of Cleves; the sorrow of the people for the deceased Queen, and the names of the chief notables present.

says Dodd, “look upon Edward Fox as they do upon the rest of the bishops of those days—that the greater part of them were swayed by interest and fear, to act contrary to their belief<sup>8</sup>.”

Roland Lee, who performed the marriage between the King and Anna Boleyn, ended his days as Bishop of Lichfield. He was a “plausible, cunning man, who contrived to live on good terms with the contending parties.” He received a portion of the monastic property, which he bequeathed to his relatives. Some Puritan writers claim him as a Reformer. There is no foundation for the claim; for, like Gardiner, Bonner, and other agents of the King, he never wavered in his faith, though by his conduct he inflicted upon it much injury and discredit.

John Longland, Bishop of Worcester, the King’s confessor, does not seem to have merited the censures cast upon him by some writers. He was much esteemed when connected with the University of Oxford. There is no charge against his reputation as a prelate, though some of his contemporaries considered him weak-minded and vain. While confessor to the King, he exercised a salutary influence over him. Upon the accession of Cranmer to power, the confessor soon lost his influence. He was strongly opposed to the Reformers; but never sought to persecute any man for his opinions; yet John Foxe endeavoured to impress upon posterity that Bishop Longland was a persecutor of the Reformers. “John Longland,” says Maister Foxe, “was a fierce and cruel vexer of the faithful and true servants of Christ<sup>9</sup>.” For this assertion, like so many other

<sup>8</sup> Dodd’s “Church Hist.,” vol. i. p. 184.

<sup>9</sup> Foxe, vol. ii. p. 820.

statements of the “Martyrologist,” we can nowhere discover any credible grounds. It is of the staple of the book—a false allegation. Dr. Longland, in the absence of Lee, Archbishop of York, officiated at the consecration of Cranmer as Archbishop.

Maurice Chauncey, the last survivor of the heroic Carthusian Fathers of the Charter House, died July, 1581, at Bruges, after a long life of toil and privation. He continued a zealous advocate of the principles of the olden creed to the close of his life. In his history of the Carthusians of the Charter House, he frequently laments not having stopped and awaited the martyrdom of his brethren. Dodd describes him as “a man of primitive zeal; and much esteemed by the English residents on the Continent.” Stuart, a Scotch puritan, states that Chauncey would do a kind office for a Protestant as soon as for one of his own creed. Anthony Wood pays a tribute to his memory. “It is not denied,” writes Wood, “by any intelligent and moderate Protestant, but that the name of Maurice Chauncey is worthy of being kept in everlasting remembrance.” In the reign of Elizabeth, Chauncey visited London in the guise of a Flemish physician, when he discovered that nearly all his former friends were either dead or immured in some loathsome dungeon. His kinsman, Dr. Chauncey, states that he accompanied him in a walk round Westminster Abbey and the wreck of the Carthusian houses. On approaching those sacred buildings, “he was seized with a profound melancholy; clasping his hands and casting his eyes downwards, he spoke not a word for some time. He then hastened from the spot; shedding many big

tears. He next visited the grave of Bishop Fisher, at Barking. Kneeling beside the last resting-place of the Bishop of Rochester he begged to be alone. Here he remained in contemplation for an hour. On the following day he left for Belgium. I never saw my good uncle again,” adds the narrator<sup>10</sup>.

Robert Wakeman, Bishop of Gloucester, died in 1549. At the period of the Monastic Inquisition, Wakeman was Abbot of Tewkesbury, and, having betrayed his brethren to Lord Cromwell, received a pension. He was subsequently translated to a bishopric. Dodd remarks that his “religion, like that of many others at the period, sat easy upon him.”

John Skip, the successor of Edward Fox in the See of Hertford, “offered some suggestions to his kinsman, Dean Layton, as to how the nunneries were to be suddenly surprised;” he took the oath of supremacy to the King; preached against the Pope, like his contemporary Tonstal; and was “generally agreeable to the measures of the Court.” He had no sympathies with the Reformers, although he has been represented as having been secretly attached to the principles of the “new learning.” On the contrary, he wrote a severe reprimand to Latimer for entertaining his friends to a “dinner of flesh, fowl, wines, and dainties on Good Friday.” Amongst Latimer’s guests at this Good Friday’s banquet were Poynet, Bale, Coverdale, and Barlow, all of whom were then, as priests, publicly preaching, without privately practising, the severe ordinances of the Catholic Church. The death of Henry, however, rendered useless further duplicity. A

<sup>10</sup> Maurice Chauncey was a native of Ireland. He was born within a few miles of the picturesque bay of Carlingford.

commentator on Dodd asks, with some point, what superior spirit or intelligence suddenly arose to set aside the pre-existing observance of fasts in the Church. Was it likely that full license in eating and drinking, and indulgence of the passions, were calculated to render the adopters of the new religion better than their sires? Bishop Skip died in 1539-40, deplored the mischief he had caused to religion by supporting the King's policy in Church and State<sup>1</sup>.

At the command of King Henry VIII., John Leland entered upon an examination of the monastic libraries and records, upon which task he bestowed six years of conscientious labour. His report has been described as the most interesting and valuable document the distinguished antiquarian ever penned. He remonstrated with Lord Cromwell on the destruction of the libraries, but Cromwell attached little value to books, and gave still less heed to the appeal of bookworms like Leland, upon whom the wholesale destruction of the libraries had such an effect, that he lost his memory and died a lunatic. He was considered the best and most learned antiquarian England had produced up to that period. An eminent scholar, a poet, an orator, with a critical knowledge of Greek and Latin, he understood French, Italian, and Spanish, and was also a master of the old Saxon and Pictish languages, which made him well qualified for examining the MS. libraries of the abbeys. Of all the subsequent writers on antiquities, &c., Camden and Sir William Dugdale appear to be the only two who had the generosity to acknowledge that they received their information from the "brain-racking" labours of John Leland. Le-

<sup>1</sup> Godwin, Griffin, Anthony Wood, and Dodd.

land's name appears among those of Henry VIIIth's chaplains; he was likewise librarian to the King.

Maister Simon Fish, a "gentleman" of Gray's-inn (1523), was the author of many scurrilous lampoons on Wolsey, and subsequently on the religious orders. He wrote a book, entitled "The Supplication of Beggars," and also a play. "His play I have not seen," observes Dodd, "but if it is written in the same strain with the 'Supplication of Beggars,' then his memory is infamous." "The Supplication of Beggars" has been printed by Dodd<sup>2</sup>, for the information of the student of history. It is a statement addressed to Henry VIII., calling his attention to the alleged crimes of Churchmen, and is, perhaps, one of the most abominable documents put forth at that evil epoch, or at any period. It charges bishops, abbots, priests, monks, and nuns, with every crime against purity that could enter into the thought of the foulest of mankind. Such a picture of shocking immorality, wholesale dishonesty, sacrilege, and hypocrisy, drawn by the imagination, stamps the portrayer with a fearful perfection. John Foxe and the "hot gospel writers" for two hundred years—and even now so far as the bigots dare venture upon its impurities—have been quoting, supplementing, in different forms, this infamous "Supplication of Beggars," to which doubtless are likewise due many a prurient passage in those novels of the past century which disgraced the literature as well as the good taste of England. A writer in the *Westminster Review*, January 1871, in a paper on Henry VIIIth's reign, has printed some extracts from Fish's "Supplication," and in doing so, implies the writer's

<sup>2</sup> Dodd's "Church Hist.," vol. i. pp. 304—309.

belief that the picture there drawn was a true presentation of the state of the religious houses. The fact was that Simon Fish, like other briefless and profligate barristers of the time—loungers about taverns, half gentlemen and whole thieves—was subsidized to draw up and publish any description of calumnious falsehood to prepare the way for the preconcerted perjuries of Layton, London, and the other inquisitors. In truth, it cannot be too often repeated, that no phase of English history has been so foully and falsely misrepresented as that which embraces the plunder and destruction of the religious institutions. The writer in the *Westminster*, however, makes an admission regarding the “profession” of which Fish was a most despicable member, that shows lawyerdom *in globo* in most unpleasant colours: “Lawyers seem to have been especially corrupt from the highest to the lowest<sup>3</sup>. ” Fish was the friend of Tyndale, “the first translator of the Protestant Bible,” and was patronised in 1528 by Anne Boleyn. He was one of the very few who attempted to impeach the character of the Carthusian Fathers. Amongst Lord Cromwell’s and Chancellor Audley’s agents there were few who so debased themselves from sheer venality as Fish. Another of his productions was an impious *brochure* of 16 pages, entitled “The Jolly Monks Surprised,” purporting to represent a visit to Reading, Glastonbury, and Bolton Abbeys. This pamphlet is only traditionally known, like many of its obscene and blasphemous fellows. Bishop Heath states that even

<sup>3</sup> In Bernard Gilpin’s Sermons, preached in the presence of judges and lawyers in Henry’s reign, and also in that of Edward VI., the reader will find a marvellously bold, but lamentably true, description of the venality and turpitude to be found in the legal profession of the period.

Dr. London did not approve of it ; then, indeed, it must have deserved a more severe judgment than the Bishop's description—"unseasonable and lying." But did the inquisitors make out any part of their report from it ? Maister Fish's career was suddenly brought to a close. He died of the plague, and his tongue swelled to such enormous dimensions that "it burst his mouth<sup>4</sup>." He holds a place amongst Maister Foxe's "Valiant Soldiers of Christ."

## ARCHBISHOP CRANMER.

[Part II.]

DEAN Hook, in one chapter, laments the "weakness of character and principle" displayed by Cranmer, whilst in another he styles him "a good man." The "weakness" ascribed to his grace of Canterbury, so far as character is concerned, was more apparent than real—in fact it had no existence. The sudden impeachment of the King's fifth wife for adultery was the next political matter in which this "weak-minded" prelate participated. His conduct in reference to Catherine Howard has been designated by some historians as that of an honest and faithful minister. He was so far faithful to Henry that he betrayed his Queen when she incurred the Royal vengeance. Was his conduct "honest" in assuring Catherine in a private interview in prison that he would obtain her pardon if she incriminated herself, and then used her confession to ensure her death ? No event in that fearful reign was fraught with such base, unmanly turpitude as the death of that defenceless girl, without trial, without proof.

<sup>4</sup> Mordaunt, his physician, describes his death-bed as one of despair and horror.

“Poor little Catherine,” as she was called—and Lady Rochford, although she died grandly, did not deserve, from her antecedents, to die in such company—demeaned herself in her last moments with the fortitude, meekness, and piety of a Christian. Otwell Johnson, an eye-witness of the tragedy, wrote to his brother, “Their sowles, I doubt not, be with God; for they made the most godly and Christyan’s end that ever was heard tell of, I think, since the world’s creation.” All of those around the scaffold are described as appearing to suffer far more than the victims. “Sobs and sighs of heartfelt sympathy were the last sounds that fell upon the ears of Catherine.” When Dr. Longland, her confessor, informed Catherine Howard that she had only “three days to live,” she appeared calm and resigned; and placing a crucifix in her right hand, she addressed Longland in these words, “As to the act, my reverend Lord, for which I stand condemned, God and his holy angels I take to witness, upon my soul’s salvation, that I die guiltless, never having so abused my Sovereign’s bed. What other sins and follies of youth I have committed, I will not excuse; but I am assured that for them God hath brought this punishment upon me, and will in His mercy remit them, for which I pray you, pray with me unto His Son and my most adorable Saviour, Jesus Christ<sup>5</sup>. ”

Catherine Howard was buried within a few yards of Anna Boleyn, and in the same shameless manner.

Dean Hook attributes no unkindness to Archbishop Cranmer for the part he took against Catherine Howard. He says the accusations against her were not proved; that every thing tends to show that she

<sup>5</sup> The Bishop of Worcester’s Correspondence with Dr. Gardyner.

was not guilty of adultery ; and “as the King’s consort, conducted herself with great propriety.” Catherine Howard’s domestic story before marriage is one of the saddest of the many sad stories which history has related.

The fact is, that Catherine—beautiful and a member of the olden creed—was becoming a power in the state, and the members of her family were strengthening round the throne to the discomfiture of the Primate. The King at this time hanged Catholics for gainsaying the royal supremacy, and burned Protestants as heretics ; so that it was simply with Cranmer an affair of temporal precedence between himself and the Queen, with her surrounding. He has been praised for denouncing to one who loved her so deeply as the King the inconstancy of the Queen, but the latest research has failed to discover better warranty for the charge against Catherine Howard, than the incitement of selfishness and faction. A statement was promulgated that Catherine Howard had confessed infidelity with four persons ; but we all know the value of such statements in the times and under the circumstances. The same statements were made in the case of Anna Boleyn, wherein the evidence of Lady Rochford sent her husband and her sister-in-law to the scaffold, and aided in the judicial murder of four English gentlemen, two of whom were weak enough, on a promise of pardon, to confess a crime of which they were not guilty, and were then, with characteristic good faith, put to death in their falsehood. In their falsehood, we repeat, for Lady Rochford, when her own time came, averred solemnly on the scaffold, that in all the testimony she had given against Anna Boleyn and her fellow-victims,

there was not a particle of truth ! The case of Catherine Howard exceeded in injustice and cruelty even that of Anna Boleyn, for she was impeached upon rumour, and executed without trial.

At that period justice and mercy lay buried in the same grave with law and precedent ; and one tyrant will ruled supreme. It was a time when, in the words of Sir James Mackintosh, “although guilt afforded no security, virtue was the surest way to destruction.” The King, for the sake of whatever human feeling remained in him, must be considered to have believed the charge against Catherine, for in his tiger nature he loved the beautiful child-wife of seventeen, and the revulsion was death to her, and wide calamity to her illustrious house. So Cranmer swept each impediment from his path, and, for Henry’s time, his influence was secured. In fact, he governed by an agile obedience.

We pass over the narratives of Lord Herbert and Burnet respecting Catherine Howard, for we can find no trustworthy documents to verify them. Sharon Turner, writing so far later, with a number of subsequently discovered papers at hand—if he chose to examine them—states that the evidence of Catherine’s guilt was “clear, gross, indisputable, and acknowledged<sup>6</sup>. ” Then why was Catherine only impeached ? Why did she not receive an open trial, and why not produce witnesses to establish her guilt ? Why not satisfy the country and posterity as to the equity of the King’s proceedings ? Cranmer and the Seymours were the only persons who could explain the mysterious story. Catherine Howard earned the deadly enmity of Cranmer and his party when she told him that she

<sup>6</sup> Turner’s “ Hist. of Eng.,” vol. x. p. 510.

could not receive Holy Communion from the hands of a married archbishop. Safer for her had she kept her scruples silent; but as a Catholic she could not, of course, do so. From that moment her fate was sealed, for she thus added personal hatred to the sense of interest which made her destruction a necessity to Cranmer.

About this time another circumstance occurred, which further illustrates the readiness of Cranmer to comply with every whim of his master. "The King's Book," in which Transubstantiation was emphatically taught, was drawn up and published, and Cranmer, who had long abandoned that great principle of the Church of Rome, now actually revised and approved the performance; and, further, commanded it to be published in every diocese and followed by every preacher<sup>7</sup>.

Cranmer was daily threatened with some fresh danger. In a conversation between King Henry and the Archbishop respecting the "numerous broils and riots" about religious tenets, the King said, "I am informed by a great many hands, that you are 'the grand heresiarch'; that it is you who encourages heterodoxy; and that were it not for your counter-paces, the Six Articles had not been so much disliked and contested in your province. I therefore desire you will deal clearly, and discover yourself upon this matter." The Archbishop replied with that apparent candour and humility which always characterized his interviews with Henry. Prostrating himself before the monarch, he said, that with all devotion and loyalty to the King, he was of the same opinion respecting the Six Articles; nevertheless he had done nothing as Archbishop of Canterbury against the enforcement of

<sup>7</sup> See Wilkins, Conc. iii., 868, also Strype.

the law. It was a strange confronting of the two. The King came close to the Archbishop, and looking in his face with an air of pleasantry and banter, asked, “Could the Archbishop of Canterbury’s bedroom stand the test of the Six Articles ?” Cranmer blushed, but admitted that he was a married man before his promotion to the See of Canterbury ; that he entered into matrimony during his visit to Rome and Germany ; but in order to obey the Six Acts he had sent his wife home to her family<sup>8</sup>.

It would come with a bad grace from King Henry to find fault with his Archbishop on the score of marriage-law or morality in any form. He was aware of the fact that Cranmer had a wife and a mistress, at a very short period from one another. But the King could not proceed on his work of religious confiscation without his “wise counsellor,” as he styled the Archbishop ; and, placing a ring on the Bishop’s finger, as a testimony of his friendship, the monarch departed. And Cranmer triumphed for the time.

We here take leave of Osiander’s niece. The young and beautiful Marguerite, with the “bright eyes and pretty little mouth,” was the most unhappy matron in the neighbourhood of Lambeth. Unacknowledged by law as the wife of the Archbishop of Canterbury—unrecognized by the usages of society—her life was a

<sup>8</sup> In Strype’s *Memorials of Cranmer* (vol. ii.) are printed the forms of “restitution” to be made by a priest who married, and, repenting for having broken his vows, was received back again by his bishop. Several priests of the province of Canterbury appeared before Archbishop Cranmer under such circumstances, “supplicating his forgiveness.” When the ceremony was over, it is probable the “sympathizing Prelate” gave them the comfort and advice which he tendered to Alexander Ales at his memorable interview in Lambeth Palace.

furtive existence, if not a prolonged endurance of self-abasement. To a woman of sensitive feeling, the condition of marriage, with a disavowed right, must have been one of misery. She could not appear in public to enjoy the holiday pageants so common to the time, in which the servants of her household might indulge. The contrast was too striking for the people, who had not been disciplined to the sudden change of celibate priests to married Archbishops. Unenlightened as were the masses, it shocked their preconceived notions to behold a mutation, as they traditionally thought so fearful, in the life of their spiritual teachers. They saw the men who had sworn at the altar to observe chastity, self-absolved, and not only taking unto themselves wives, but abetting polygamy, and escheating, by false evidence, the possessions of the poor. No marvel, then, that an episcopal helpmate was regarded as something formidably strange—an object of timorous avoidance. Concubinage was in a manner tolerated by the looseness of the age; but a "bishop's wife" was a woman against whom the Reformers themselves felt a certain amount, to use their most delicate phrase, of "unpleasant feeling." Even the removal of the Six Acts did not alter the position in society of a priest's or a bishop's wife. There is little or no foundation, doubtless, for many of the coarse anecdotes related by Saunders or Griffin, as to the "degraded condition" of Mrs. Cranmer, but her position was sad enough. In her second marriage, however, Dame Cranmer was more happy than in her first. Still young and handsome, and devoid of the Puritan mannerism which characterized many of the "Reforming women" of her day, she was more suited to become the wife of the

frank-hearted and hospitable printer, Edward Whitchurch, than that of an “old, jealous, peevish, white-bearded bishop,” whom she never loved.

Like Wolsey, Thomas Cranmer, in his youth, was one whose society was much courted. He had many pleasing associations of early life to look back upon—days when innocence and hope had shed a “bright and holy sunshine on his soul.” A good son, a good brother, and “abounding in benevolence,” he had been sought after by the needy and the unfortunate. As the son of a country squire, he had been popular with the people, for his love of field sports. At Cambridge, as a student, he had been regarded with affection and esteem; and in the private circles of the town he won golden opinions; and there were others besides “Black Joan,” on whom the charms of his conversation had made an impression. His vocation was *not* that of an ecclesiastic, and it would indeed have been well for his fame, his honour, and his happiness, had he never become a cleric.

There would appear to have been genial features in the character of Cranmer. He wrote, for instance, to Henry an eloquent and very perilous defence of Lord Cromwell. In this letter to the King on Cromwell’s behalf, he declares “that no monarch was ever so beloved by a subject, or served with more fidelity by a minister than his Highness had been by Lord Cromwell.” Not even so great a favourite as Archbishop Cranmer could moderate the royal vengeance. The King upon reading the Archbishop’s letter, observed to Denny, “The traitor lord never extended pity nor mercy to one of his victims, and by — — — J — he shall receive none from me!” Denny attempted to

reply, but the monarch placed his finger upon his lips, which indicated that the fate of Thomas Lord Cromwell was sealed. In Cranmer's effort to save the "Vicar-General," he stood almost alone, for both contending parties seemed unanimous in desiring the fall of Cromwell, who appeared to have pleased none of them, either in his conduct or in his requisitions. By the former he disappointed one party; by the latter he infuriated the other. But his success with Henry had made enemies of all. Such is the inconsistency of human nature, even in the highest intellects, that Cranmer dared in the cause of Cromwell an advocacy which betokened gratitude, whilst he violated that virtue in the case of his Queen. Some incidents, however, connected with Cromwell's fall make very doubtful the sincerity of Cranmer's interposition.

#### THOMAS CROMWELL THE GRAND INQUISITOR.

THE great art of the politician in Cromwell's judgment, was to penetrate the various disguises which Kings are accustomed to throw over their real inclinations, and to devise the most specious expedients by which they may gratify their passions, without appearing to outrage morality or religion. Reginald Pole states that he "heard lessons to this effect from the lips of Thomas Cromwell in the palace of Cardinal Wolsey".

Mr. Froude differs widely from those who had a personal knowledge of Lord Cromwell, whom he thus unpremeditatedly describes: "To him belonged the rare privilege of genius to see what other men could not see, and therefore he was condemned to rule a generation

<sup>9</sup> Pole, 133; also Pole's discourse with John Legh, on Machiavelli MSS.

which hated him, to do the will of God, and to perish in his success. He had no party<sup>1</sup>." Dean Hook, who has had access to more material, and has treated that material with candour and honesty, gainsays Mr. Froude's eulogy of the Grand Inquisitor. "The exposure of a lie," writes the Dean, "is a victory on the side of truth. In his effort to create a public opinion against the monasteries, Lord Cromwell resorted to measures which, if they are regarded with feelings of approbation by any, must be so only by the mere partisans of religion, and not by persons under the influence of a religion, the characteristic virtue of which is charity<sup>2</sup>." It is, in truth, difficult to form an idea of the heartlessness, cruelty, and baseness of Thomas Cromwell. Like Domitian, he not only procured a death, but presided at the execution. He attended the stake, the scaffold, and the rack, to deride and insult his victims. He went in state to the burning of Dr. Forest, chaplain to Queen Katherine, who was condemned for having denied the King's supremacy, and advocated the cause of his injured Queen. "It was a fearful sight," writes a spectator.

The Franciscans were especial objects of Cromwell's cruelty and greed. They were in reality wretchedly poor, but Cromwell believed them secretly rich. Like his contemporary Pizarro<sup>3</sup> with the hapless Peruvians, he tried rack and fire to solve the question of Franciscan wealth. He therefore racked and hanged those friars by dozens.

<sup>1</sup> Froude's "Hist. of Eng." vol. ii. p. 444.

<sup>2</sup> "Archbishops of Canterbury," vol. vi. p. 95.

<sup>3</sup> In less than a year after the execution of Cromwell, his Spanish counterpart in greed fell by the hands of an assassin in his palace at Lima, 1541.

Mr. Froude describes Cromwell on some occasions as “prosecutor, jury, and judge.” But it seems an unnatural inhumanity which prompted him to be present at the immolation of his victims. The same author impresses on his readers that Thomas Cromwell’s aim “was noble.” A less eccentric public will fail hopelessly to see any thing noble in any one of his actions. In a MS. memorandum in Cromwell’s own handwriting, still extant, are to be seen an account of his “daily labours in a noble cause:”—“Item—The Abbot of Reading to be tried<sup>4</sup> and executed at Reading, with his accomplices. Item—The Abbot of Glastonbury to be tried at Glaston, and also to be executed there with his accomplices. Item—To advertise the King of the execution of Maister Fisher (the Bishop). Item—To know his (the King’s) pleasure touching Maister More. Item—To send unto the King by Ruffle, the behaviour of Maister Fisher. Item—To send Gurdon to the Tower to be racked.”

See how naturally this demonstrator of “noble aims” makes execution follow trial! There is no lack of Protestant testimony as to the cruelties of Cromwell. “It is a remarkable circumstance,” writes Dean Hook, “that while the administration of the Supremacy Act was confided to Lord Cromwell, the persecutions were so numerous as to defy calculation.” And again, the Dean considers Cromwell’s “religion” purely political. “When he desired to rouse the people against the monks he patronized the most violent preachers amongst the Reformers, and when his design was accomplished, then he sought the support of the oppo-

<sup>4</sup> The phrase “tried,” used above, generally signified “impeachment,” which was almost immediately followed by execution.

site party to carry out the Six Acts against the Reformers." A very old policy, not yet out of fashion, of playing one party against another.

To conciliate Cromwell was an inevitable policy with the apprehensive religious orders. The number of monks, nuns, and others who sent presents to the Lord Cromwell to "stave off the evil day," or "to have mercy," has been set down by contemporary authorities with some exaggeration, but recent researches prove the applications to have been vastly numerous. The Abbess of Godstowe<sup>5</sup>, in order to "conciliate the Lord Cromwell," appointed him to the stewardship of the estate belonging to the sisterhood, which he accepted, as well as all the presents the sisters could collect. The Priory of Durham sent him presents of gold and silver; the offerings of game, fowl, &c., were also very large. The Abbess of Shaftesbury sends him on one occasion, 100 marks; "a noble lord places in Lord Cromwell's hands a sum of 40*l.* to obtain for him a grant of a well-endowed monastery;" a lady of rank sends him 20*l.* "to seek his good offices;" several bishops sent him sums of ten and twenty pounds by way of New Year's gifts; the young Queen, Jane Seymour, sent him "vails," as did also Lord Hertford and his brother, the Admiral. Sums of money were transmitted to him in costly gloves; "gold pieces" were even placed under his pillow, enclosed in papers, "with certain names and requests;" even in the windows of his apartments sums of money were deposited also "with names and requests;" and Cranmer himself

<sup>5</sup> This Benedictine House was founded by King Alfred. Godestone, or Godstow, was founded in the reign of Henry the First, by Editha, a young maiden of great beauty and piety.

thought it necessary to win favour with Cromwell by allowing him 40*l.* a year (about 400*l.* of our present money) as “a memorial of his friendship.” “In Cromwell,” says Mr. Froude, “the questionable practice of most great men of his time—the practice of receiving pensions and presents for general support and patronage—was carried to an extent which, even then, perhaps, appeared excessive.” But the case of Cromwell in this instance differs from other corrupt ministers, from the fact that the great majority of people, in his case, “made presents” from fear of life and property. From what feeling did Archbishop Cranmer give him 40*l.* per annum? No one will believe that it was from “friendship,” for Cranmer knew his sordid and treacherous “friend” too well. Mr. Froude also admits that the spy system was carried to an enormous extent at home and abroad, by Lord Cromwell. “He bought information any where, and at any cost; and secret-service money for such purposes he must have provided, like his successor, in the same policy, Francis Walsingham.” “He bought his information any where, and at any cost.” This avowal, on the part of a friendly historian, will enable the most unreflecting to estimate the value of the “information supplied” by the monastic inquisitors. It has been stated by more than one much-read author that Lord Cromwell was influenced by “no mean or sordid feeling,” but this assertion can scarcely be applied to any of the public men of the time. “Courtiers,” writes Fuller, “keep what they catch, and catch what they can.” Thomas

<sup>6</sup> MS. Life of Thomas Lord Cromwell; also MS. Records of Presents to Lord Cromwell.

<sup>7</sup> Froude, vol. iii. p. 444.

Cromwell “set down to his own name”—as his own share of abbey lands—*no less than thirty manors*—no mean proof that he was in nowise oblivious of his own interests, and that the information he bought was worthy of the man by whom it was purchased<sup>8</sup>.

Lord Cromwell’s mode of living was most luxurious—his tastes profuse and wasteful. Yet his domestic arrangements, we are informed, manifested the upstart profusion of the “fortunate plebeian rather than of the cultivated sybarite.” On one occasion he ordered his chief steward to stop the meat supplies of his vast establishment, to purchase no more mutton, but to stock the larders with venison. The hint was at once taken, and immense consignments of deer-flesh reached the stores of the “Lord Cromwell,” from all parts and persons, but chiefly from the religious houses. He indulged in gambling, dicing, dancing, and theatrical displays, which latter he exhibited on a large and expensive scale, for the delectation of the Court. He seemed to possess all the requirements of the versatile favourite of a monarch not over-nice in his tastes. He suggested improvements in the dresses of Henry, and the Queen Consort for the time, whilst his own apparel was magnificent. On one occasion he paid 2000*l.* for a diamond and ruby (20,000*l.* of our present money); at his banquets he assumed the air and state of a Wolsey; but the imitation failed. “It was the rind without the kernel;” for Cromwell was comparatively unlettered, and showed a Vandal spirit in destroying the monastic libraries, whilst the great Cardinal was not only learned himself, but a munificent patron of learning.

<sup>8</sup> “Records of Monastic Confiscations.”

Cromwell was no Latin scholar, although Foxe asserts that while in Italy he learned Erasmus's Latin translation of the New Testament by heart. Of course this statement of Foxe has been handed down from one historian to another, and generally adopted. Dean Hook states that it is "probable during the course of his busy and disreputable life, he (Cromwell) could have afforded no time for such studies." In a "communicative moment," Cromwell once informed Archbishop Cranmer that in early life he had been a "ruffian" (a fellow who lived by the sword). Several authorities agree in the tradition, that "when in countries beyond the seas he joined a party of freebooters, and soon after came upon the treasure of a great lord, and then, like a cunning thief, suddenly disappeared from his companions." That he accumulated a large amount of gold and jewels by some unknown means is beyond a doubt; and it is equally true that he deceived and despoiled more or less all who employed or trusted him. The question has been more than once asked, what could have been the religious sentiments of a man who had thus graduated from youth upwards, and who was the originator and patron of the shocking and blasphemous scenes which disgraced London during his administration. "The Lord Cromwell," writes Dr. Maitland, "was the great patron of the ribaldry, and the protector of the ribalds, of the low jester, the filthy ballad-monger, the alehouse singers, and the hypocritical religious gatherings—in short, of all the blasphemous mocking and scoffing which disgraced the Protestant party at the time of the Reformation<sup>9</sup>." Some romances, called history, have

<sup>9</sup> Maitland's "English Reformers," p. 236.

lauded Cromwell for his magnanimous defence of his “good master,” Cardinal Wolsey; but the truth is that he defended the Cardinal as a “paid advocate.” Circumstances compelled the Cardinal to accept his services, though he had no confidence in him. In the memorable scene wherein Wolsey took leave of his numerous and loving domestics, Cromwell cried and sobbed, and kissed his “good master’s” hand, whilst the hypocrite may have had even then upon his person a portion of the jewels and gold which but two hours before he had plundered from the same “good master.” He immediately made terms with the King, to the detriment of his illustrious patron. The heart of the great statesman must have been broken, and his spirit in the dust, when he, who knew the utter worthlessness of the present favourite of the King, could condescend to address the creature whom he had made as “mine own entirely beloved Cromwell!” Human grandeur—at best a fleeting bubble—could hardly have expended itself upon a more fruitless waste.

Cavendish records the parting between Wolsey and his household:—“ My Lord Cardinal commanded me to call all his gentlemen and yeomen up into the great chamber, commanding all the gentlemen to stand on the right, and the yeomen on the left; at last my lord came out, in his rochet upon a violet gown, like a bishop; he went with his chaplains to the upper end of the chamber, where was a great window. Beholding his goodly number of servants, he could not speak to them until the tears run down his cheeks, which being perceived by his servants caused fountains of tears to gush out of their sorrowful eyes, in such manner and way as would make any heart relent.” Cavendish makes no mention

of Thomas Cromwell being present; but we are assured by Maister Wallop that he “came in the night and tarried till the next day; and was full of tears and sorrow for his good maister, the Cardinal.”

The private papers of Cromwell himself have set at rest for ever his claims to the character of being grateful, or of even being commonly honest, or his hands free from downright thieving. Mr. Froude’s favourite authority, the most veracious Master Foxe, bepraises Cromwell’s “integrity, goodness, and piety,” and closes up with designating him as “the valiant soldier of Christ.” As the people of our day have justly learned to believe the reverse of what Foxe writes, the value of this blasphemous designation can at once be estimated. In Cavendish’s “Life of Wolsey” (3rd edition), “Wordsworth’s Ecclesiastical Biography” (vol. i. p. 568), are to be found some incidents recorded which fully sustain the general impeachment of Cromwell’s character; also in Robertson’s “Charles the Fifth” (vol. ii. p. 286), on the sacking of Rome in 1527, the reader will perceive the part taken in that fearful scene of massacre, plunder, and sacrilege, by an “Englishman of low birth,” who is supposed to have been Thomas Cromwell, then in the service of Wolsey, and in Rome on his master’s business. Lord Herbert has no doubt that Cromwell was present at the sack of Rome, and that he took part in it as a soldier in the army of Charles Duke of Bourbon. The affairs of the Cardinal, whatever they were, afforded time to Cromwell to share in the general plunder of the unfortunate city, to which he was accredited on a peaceful mission. But throughout life he could act many parts in one day.

Stowe states that Cromwell was "hospitable and benevolent." "I have seen," he says, "above two hundred persons served every day with meat and drink at Lord Cromwell's gate." Here is Latimer's description of his social qualities:—"My very good lord is mighty fond of prime belly cheer himself, and unlike those that ate a goodly mess often themselves, would not give a mouthful to those that are hungry, my Lord Cromwell sayeth to his people;—'make merrie, there is plenty of belly cheer in my house.' Whatever the lack of good in the monks, they were wonderous thoughtful in supplying with a goodly feeling belly cheer to those who were hungry or cast-off by the world for their failings. It is but truth to say, that my very good Lord Cromwell was as free a giver of belly cheer as any monk in the realm."

In Nichol's "History and Antiquities of Leicestershire," printed in 1800, there is (commencing p. 312) an interesting account of the Priory of Laund, in that county, which was granted to Lord Cromwell at the dissolution. The work contains two well engraved heads of the Vicar-General and his son Gregory Cromwell, who, by a patent, December 18, 1540, was created Baron Cromwell, of Okeham. From Cromwell's house sprang the once distinguished Irish branch, which possessed the titles of Viscounts Lecale and Earls of Ardglass. Anne, daughter of Edward third Lord Cromwell, married Sir Edward Wingfield, Knight, of Powerscourt<sup>1</sup>, county Wicklow; and the head of the Wingfield family is now Lord Viscount Powerscourt, the most deservedly beloved and respected of his race, for the Wingfields, up to comparatively recent times, were

<sup>1</sup> Called "Poore's Court," by Dugdale, in his "Baronage."

noted for their active hostility to the religious and political liberties of the Irish people. The present young peer is a noble exception.

Cromwell was at the height of his power when the time of his fall arrived. The plans of his enemies were carefully arranged, and he was quite unconscious, it is averred, of the precipice on which he stood. He seemed to have no notion of his danger until having entered the Council Chamber and taken his seat, the Duke of Norfolk suddenly “arose and impeached him for high treason and heresy<sup>2</sup>.” Cromwell sat speechless—he was at once arrested and conveyed to the Tower. The proceedings against him were characterized by an eager haste, and the utmost disregard of even the forms of law. There was a retributive similarity in his case to those of so many of his victims, which cannot fail to impress the reader. The House of Peers, without trial, examination, or evidence, condemned to death the “most powerful minister of the age”—a man who but a few days before they had declared worthy of “being elected Vicar-General of the universe<sup>3</sup>.” But notwith-

<sup>2</sup> The arrest of Thomas Cromwell took place on Friday, June 14 (1540), about three of the clock. When the Duke of Norfolk finished his impeachment speech, Lord Chancellor Audley, who dined so frequently at the Lord Cromwell’s hospitable table, advanced across the floor, and laying his hand on the shoulder of *his friend*, said, “My Lord Crumwell, I now arrest you for high treason against the King’s Highness.” Roland Lee states that he was informed by one of the Council that it was a painful scene: the man whom they all respected so much yesterday they now treated like a dog—or something worse—to-day. Lord Cromwell looked confounded; despair was written on his face immediately. Nearly thirty people knew of the intended impeachment, yet so closely was the secret kept that Cromwell’s spies could not catch even a whisper of it.

<sup>3</sup> Stowe’s Chronicle; Hume, vol. iii. (folio edit.); Turner, vol. x.; Lingard, vol. iv.

standing this flattery, they hated Cromwell, because he was not “by birth of their own order.” Indeed, the action of the Lords against Cromwell might have been anticipated from the inconsistency or treachery of a powerful friend. Archbishop Cranmer, who had so recently written to the King in favour of Cromwell, now joined his enemies; and, as Lingard observes, “he deemed it prudent to go along with the stream, and on the second and third reading he gave his vote in favour of the bill of attainder.” The Commons made a show of opposition in passing the bill, but soon obeyed a ready menace from the Crown. Hume, who wishes to uphold the character of Cromwell, observes that the “only circumstance of his conduct, by which he could have merited his fate was his being the instrument of the King’s tyranny in conducting iniquitous bills of attainder in the former session of Parliament against the aged Countess of Salisbury and other noble personages.” Hume also contends that Cromwell was “worthy of a better master, and of a better fate.” When in the Tower, under sentence of death, the “proud minister of yesterday,” became the most craven and abject of beings, looking on every side for some means of pity or mercy. In this prostrate condition he wrote many letters to the King, but in vain. When Henry brooded in silence over the fate of his victims, the moment of their doom could almost be named; yet he is said to have shed tears on reading the following passage in his fallen minister’s letter:—“I, a most woful prisoner, am ready to submit to death when it shall please God and your Majesty, and still the frail flesh incites me to call to your Grace for mercy and pardon of mine offences. Written at the Tower, with a heavy

heart and trembling hand of your highness's most miserable prisoner and poor slave, Thomas Cromwell." And again he writes, "Most gracious prince, I cry for mercy, mercy, mercy." In another letter Cromwell compares the King's "*smiles and frowns to those of God; and beseeches him to suffer his wretched prisoner to kiss his balmy hand once more, that the fragrance thereof might fit him for heaven*"<sup>4</sup>. Such a degraded state of feeling as that which inspired these blasphemous appeals only elicited the contempt of the unforgiving monarch. Phillips, Wallop, and Harold, officials of the Tower, describe Cromwell as "crying out to the Holy Mother to save him;" that "he was in an awful dread of death; that he caught a priest by the robe, tears rolling down his face, and besought his prayers;" "that he said the vengeance of heaven overtook him at last;" that "he was cursed by the Church and the people."

Amongst the general accusations against Lord Cromwell were those of receiving bribes, clandestinely giving licences for the exportation of prohibited goods, making false returns of public moneys; also payment for situations, and many other misdeeds.

The Duke of Norfolk had long entertained a personal hostility to Cromwell, and having met him at a banquet at Archbishop Cranmer's, the Duke, it is alleged, used coarse and vindictive language to Cromwell, and the latter declared he would soon have satisfaction against the Howards. Be this as it may, a combination then formed against Lord Cromwell, became irresistible, and his fall was reduced to merely a question of time.

<sup>4</sup> Burnet, vol. i. p. 281; Hume, vol. iii. (folio), p. 241, 242.

There are some curious incidents recorded as to who really brought about the Vicar-General's overthrow. Catherine Parr (the future Queen) seems to have been the chief person engaged in compassing his ruin. Lady Parr had "an interview with the King on behalf of her relative, George Throckmorton, then a prisoner in the Tower; on this occasion she gave his highness minute particulars of the peculations, sales of patronage, and tyranny practised by Cromwell<sup>5</sup>." Some recent writers confirm those statements, and add that the youth, beauty, and address of Catherine Parr enabled her to make a fatal impression on the monarch as to the demerits of Cromwell. Catherine Parr was at the time a Catholic of the Papal party. When Queen one of Cromwell's favourite estates was conferred on her by the Crown.

Cromwell's panegyrist, Sharon Turner, states that he suffered from the same severity he "inflicted on others." In this opinion other biographers concur. But there were incidents connected with the severities which Cromwell inflicted that did not characterize those with which *he* was visited. Besides, his chief victims were eminent for their virtues. Upon the execution of Fisher and More, the French sovereign, through his minister, communicated with Lord Cromwell and King Henry upon the "shocking affair of sending such virtuous men to the scaffold." The King of France "advises banishment, but not death." Cromwell replies "rather sharply," "he rejects the humane advice of Francis;" and in writing to the English ambassador at Paris, he says, "It was neither

<sup>5</sup> Willis's "Hist. of the Throckmorton Family;" and Pollino's Chronicle.

the office of a friend or of a brother, to counsel the King to banish his traitors into strange parts, where they might have good occasion, times, place, and opportunity, to do their feats of treason and conspiracies.” In another letter to the English ambassador, Cromwell describes “the treasonable practices” of Fisher and More. “They had such malice rooted in their hearts against their prince, and for the total destruction of the common weal of the realm, were well worthy, *if they had had a thousand lives, to have suffered ten times a more terrible death*<sup>6</sup>.” Turner questions the genuineness of this despatch, but other historians, including even Burnet, state it as beyond doubt. The secret correspondence and memoranda of Cromwell attest his sanguinary nature. The character he has given of Fisher and More is not sustained by any one circumstance, document, or by witness possessing an atom of reputation.

A contemporary of Cromwell says, “No man was ever so deserted by friends as my Lord Cromwell; and the savage people doth rejoice like devils, because a good, worthy man is about to die at the block.” Hume declares, “The people were averse to him, as the supposed author of the violences on the monasteries—establishments which were still revered and beloved by the commonalty. The Catholics regarded him as the concealed enemy of their religion. The Protestants, observing his exterior concurrence with all the persecutions exercised against them, were inclined to bear him as little favour, and reproached him with the timidity, if not treachery, of his conduct. And the

<sup>6</sup> French Despatches in State Papers; Burnet, Speed, Rapin, Hume, and Lingard.

King, who found that great clamours had on all hands arisen against the administration, was not displeased to throw on Cromwell the load of public hatred; and he hoped, by so easy a sacrifice, to regain the affections of his subjects<sup>7</sup>.” Cromwell held the office of Lord Privy Seal, Lord Chamberlain, and Master of the Wards. He was also a Knight of the Garter—an honour only conferred on men of illustrious family. The Duke of Norfolk and the old nobility hated him; and the clergy, over whom he exercised an almost absolute power, feared him. He was “respected and fawned upon;” every where he met smiles, and assurances of support, whilst being universally execrated by Englishmen of every shade of opinion; and the day of his execution was one of public rejoicing.

The statements of some of the older and more pronounced Protestant writers might be amusing but for the sad fact of succeeding historians adopting them for authorities—in thus doing, suiting or forming the prejudices of their readers. Oldmixon, Rapin, Carte, and Speed, consider Lord Cromwell the “victim of a Popish conspiracy.” “The majority of the people,” writes Oldmixon, “loved the Lord Cromwell, because he was a true Protestant; half the nation were Protestants, and those that were Papists approved of the suppression of the monkish rookeries.” Oldmixon affirms that Cromwell was “murdered” at the instigation of friars and nuns. Rapin describes Lord Cromwell as “immolated to Popish fury.” And Foxe is of opinion that Cromwell’s death caused great spiritual destitution, the “Bible having been withdrawn from the people.” A simple question may here be asked, How many people in all

<sup>7</sup> Hume’s “Hist. of England,” vol. iii. (fol.) p. 210.

Eugland could, at the period, read the Bible or any other book? Speed and Foxe occasionally find fault with Cromwell for "allowing himself to be led by the nuns;" for instance, it is alleged that a statute passed in 1539, to "punish immoral clerics, was at the suggestion of several abbesses and prioresses;" but the absurdity of such a statement is its own refutation. It is more probable that the statute originated with the King in one of his "short penitential moods." The Act in question decreed for violation of celibacy, adultery, or marriage, by a priest, the first offence forfeiture of goods or imprisonment during the King's pleasure; and to be charged with the same crime a second time, the offender was to be hanged and quartered. The Bishop of Winchester, however, moved the omission of the latter clause. This bill was supported in the House of Lords by Archbishop Cranmer, and Shaxton<sup>8</sup>, Bishop of Salisbury, both of whom were privately married at the time. Surely, after all, Reformers should not find fault with any one—be he Cromwell or otherwise—who would punish immorality. But Foxe, Oldmixon, and others, we must recollect, regarded the violation of vows, which the ancient religion regarded as a Catholic crime, to be in reality a prime Protestant virtue.

After recurring to the immense services rendered by Cromwell, Mr. Froude describes him as the "most despotic minister that England had ever seen," that "all parties hated him—even those whom he served;" that "the Popish party were loud in their acclamations

<sup>8</sup> Nicholas Shaxton subsequently recanted the principles he adopted, from the "reasoning" of his friend Archbishop Cranmer. He "made and subscribed" a very solemn public declaration of his firm belief in all the tenets of the Church of Rome. See Collier, vol. v. p. 159, 160.

and joy at his fall ;” that the “ remnant of the old English nobles,” exulted at his misfortune ; the house of Norfolk were enthusiastic, and Lord Surrey exclaimed, “ Now is that foul churl dead, so ambitious of the blood of others ; now is he stricken down with his own staff ;” that “ Francis the First congratulated Henry ;” that the Emperor Charles the Fifth exclaimed jubilantly, “ So he hath reached the Tower as a prisoner ;” that “ the Pope and the Cardinals rejoiced ;” that “ the common people whom he had sustained had forgotten him,” and “ he passed away without the sympathies of the population.” Even if Mr. Froude had not stated these facts respecting Cromwell, there is self-contradiction enough in the following description, to detract from the worship he would fain secure for the great monastic inquisitor :—“ He pursued an object, the excellence of which as his mind saw it, transcended all other considerations—the freedom of England and the destruction of idolatry ; those who from any motive, noble or base, pious or impious, crossed his path, he crushed and passed on over their bodies. . . . *His aim was noble.* For his actions he paid with his life ; and he followed his victims by the same road which they had trodden before him, to the high tribunal where, it may be, that great natures who on earth have lived in mortal enmity may learn at last to understand each other.”

Notwithstanding this inconsistent eulogy, posterity can discern in Cromwell nothing but a bold, bad, ambitious man. He has been pronounced sincere—yet he pretended to be of one religion whilst he died in another, and left the last will and testament of a Roman Catholic ; honest—why he not only bore false witness,

but embezzled the fruits of his perjury, and finally perished, professing his return to a creed whose doctrines he had disavowed, and so many of whose ministers he had beggared or slain. Divested of word-painting, this is the true picture of the “most despotic minister England had ever seen.”

It has been stated that Cromwell expressed on the scaffold much contrition for the part he took in the confiscation of Church property, and “other deeds against the olden religion of England.” But a recent writer is at issue with many in respect to this statement; and contends that the speech attributed to Cromwell at Tower Hill was a forgery, and that put forward by Foxe is the “genuine prayer.” It is rather strange that Burnet should not have given the document published as Cromwell’s dying speech by Foxe as genuine, and which, by the way, when examined, looks more like the studied performance of Poynet and Bale, than the words of a man who appeared on the scaffold in “confusion and tears,” betraying the most abject terror of his doom. Did Burnet justly doubt the authenticity of Foxe’s “speech,” or what motive induced him to give, in his “Reformation,” a “Catholic declaration” with an endeavour to translate it in a Protestant sense? The following is the scaffold-speech attributed to Thomas Cromwell by Burnet:—“He acknowledged his sins against God, and his offences against the King who had raised him from a base degree. He declared that he *died in the Catholic faith, not doubting of any article of faith, or of any Sacrament of the Church.* And he denied that he had been a supporter of those who had delivered evil opinions. He confessed he had been seduced, but *now died in the Catholic faith;* he desired

them to pray for the King, for the prince, and for himself ; and then prayed fervently for the remission of his past sins, and admission into eternal glory.” That this version of Cromwell’s dying words is the true one, and not that of Foxe, derives much proof from the fact of Burnet taking the trouble of endeavouring to explain it according to his own wishes, which he essays as follows :—“ By what he (Cromwell) spoke at his death, he left it much to be doubted of what religion he died ; *but it is certain he was a Lutheran.* The term *Catholic faith*, used by him, seemed to make it doubtful, but that it was then used in England in its true sense, in opposition to the *novelties* of the See of Rome<sup>9</sup>.” Neither Foxe nor any of his eccentric modern admirers could make a statement more discordant with fact than the above. At the time of Cromwell’s death (1540), there was no established Protestant Liturgy of England. If the “novelties of the See of Rome” were set aside by the Reformers—if the Reformation, as alleged, were merely a recurrence to the ancient purity of belief, where have we the ancient and reverend Liturgy ? We hear not a word of *that* ; and it was not until 1547 that Cranmer and his colleagues set about the “arrangement” of a *new* Liturgy out of existing Popish materials. In Cromwell’s time the Reformers were merely in rebellion against Rome—an insurgency strong and expansive as the temporal possessions of Rome in the island. Every thing was in confusion. In choosing a faith the Reformers had to make choice between the shifting doctrines of Luther, who permitted polygamy to his patron, the abstract principles of Zwingle, or the savage dogmatisms of Knox. The quarrels about re-

<sup>9</sup> Burnet, Reformation, vol. i. part i. pp. 516, 517 (Oxford edit. 1816).

spective elements of belief were bitter amongst the early Reformers, whilst the King, the greater portion of the independent nobility, and the mass of the people remained adherents of the Roman Catholic faith ; for Henry only desired to plunder the Roman Catholic Church, not to gainsay her doctrines, which he never did. What did Cromwell mean by saying “not doubting of any article of faith, or of any Sacrament of the Church ?” Of what Church ? Protestantism was not proclaimed for seven years after his death. Again he says, “he had been seduced.” Seduced from what ? And to what did he return ? As before said, he had not Protestantism to return to, and he must fain recur to the Church of his great patrons, Wolsey and Pace. There was no other. “Novelties of the See of Rome !” If they were “novelties,” why did not the Reformers recur to the more ancient *cultus*, if such there were ? Instead of this they merely lopped some branches from the Roman trunk, and set them up to become so many independent offshoots of belief as we find at present in England. But the most remarkable version of Cromwell’s dying speech is that chronicled by John Stowe, which is as follows :—“I am come hither to die, and not to purge myself, as some think, peradventure, that I will. For if I should so do, I were a very wretch and miser. I am by the law condemned to die, and thank my Lord God that hath appointed me this death for mine offence. For since the time that I have had years of discretion I have lived a sinner, and offended my Lord God, for the which I ask Him heartily forgiveness. And it is not unknown to many of you that I have been a great traveller in this world, and, being but of base degree, I was called to high estate, and

since the time I came thereunto, I have offended my Prince, for the which I ask him heartily forgiveness; and I beseech you all to pray to God with me, that He will forgive me. And now I pray you that be here, to bear mere cord, *I die in the Catholic faith, not doubting in any article of my faith; no, nor doubting in any Sacrament of the Church.* Many have slandered me, and reported that I have been a hearer of such as have maintained evil opinions; which is untrue. But, I confess, that like as God, by His Holy Spirit, doth instruct us in the truth—so the devil is ready to seduce us—and I have been seduced. But bear witness now, that *I die in the Catholic faith of the Holy Church.* And I heartily desire you to pray for the King's Grace, that he may long live with you in health and prosperity, and that after him his son, Prince Edward, that goodly *impe* (child) may long reign over you. And once again I desire you to pray for me, that, *so long as life remaineth in this flesh I waver nothing in my faith*<sup>1</sup>."

It has been contended, in connexion with Stowe's narrative of Cromwell's last moments, that he (Stowe) was a "Papist and a weak-minded man." Strange, in reply to a statement so explicit, the truth should be that Stowe was a Reformer, and that in the reign of Elizabeth his patrons were Archbishop Parker, Bale, Coverdale, the Cecils and Dudleys, all of whom may be fairly considered to have an interest in imparting a Protestant colouring to Cromwell's scaffold-picture. From John Foxe's day to the present all the writers who profess zeal for Protestantism have manifested the

<sup>1</sup> John Stowe's "Chronicle;" Dodd's "History," vol. i. p. 312. For curious incidents connected with Cromwell's last speech, see Hall, Heylin, Pomeroy, Joscelin, Carte, and Echard.

desire to place Cromwell on the roll of Protestant martyrs. But all Cromwell's Protestantism consisted in his combination with bad Catholics—to plunder the religious houses, and slay, torture, imprison, beggar, or exile their inmates. Such was the extent of Cromwell's Protestantism; and such, probably, would have proved the utmost stretch of the Protestantism of all his wicked *confrères* had they been put to the same fiery ordeal—repentance and vindication of their belief in the creed of their fathers. One consideration has hitherto been omitted in treating of Thomas Cromwell's dying moments. His mother had been a most pious Catholic; and doubtless the religious teachings received at the mother's knee in the morning of life lingered on the memory through the years of manhood and age, and revived in characters of light as the clouds of worldly concerns passed away in the presence of eternity. No man knows what power may have had the recollection of the pious mother on the dying statesman, the hitherto hardened worldling; and charity hopes that the repentance he manifested may have been efficacious unto salvation, as it certainly, even to the worldly judgment, has somewhat softened our condemnation of his career.

Again, let us see Thomas Cromwell's famous "will," which is just as anti-Protestant as the "genuine prayer" of Foxe is anti-Popish. Here is a specimen quoted by Mr. Froude:—"First—I bequeath my soul to the great God of Heaven, my Maker, Creator, and Redeemer, beseeching the most glorious Virgin and Blessed Lady Saint Mary the Virgin and Mother, with all the holy company of Heaven, to be mediators and intercessors for me to the Holy Trinity, so that I may be

able, when it shall please Almighty God to call me out of this miserable world and transitory life, to inherit the Kingdom of Heaven." . . . After bequeathing moneys, chattels, &c., to various relatives and friends, he speaks of charity—"works for the health of his soul." "I will," he says, "mine executors shall sell said farm (Carberry) and the money thereof to be employed in deeds of charity, to prayer for my soul, and all Christian souls." *Item*—"I will mine executors shall conduct and hire a *priest*, being an honest person of continent and good living, to sing (pray) for my soul for the space of seven years next *after my death*, and to give him for the same 20*l.* 13*s.* 4*d.* for his stipend." *Item*—"I give and bequeath to every one of the five orders of Friars within the Citie of London, *to pray for my soul*, twenty shillings." *Item*—"I give and bequeath to 60 poor maidens in marriage, 40*l.*—that is to say 13*s.* 4*d.* to every one of the said poor maidens." . . . He further bequeaths 20*l.* to be distributed amongst "poor householders, *to pray for his soul*." There are several other items set down, in the "old Popish fashion," for "prayers and benevolence," *after* the testator's death. This will was drawn by Cromwell on the 12th July, 1529, and he commenced his career as Henry's "Vicar-General" in 1534; he ascended the scaffold in 1540; and it may be, and has been argued that, "with change of religious principles, Cromwell altered his will." He never did so, and the fact is a very strong proof against his Protestantism. Dean Hook states that some "five or six years after the execution of the will, Cromwell had occasion to correct it, when the bequest for prayers to be made for his soul were *retained*; and it is proved that this was not an oversight, for as regarded the

priest who was to pray for the dead, he desired him *to continue his services for seven years, and he increased his stipend from 20*l.* to 40*l.* 12*s.* 6*d.**" Dean Hook further remarks :—"The partisans of Cromwell have considered as not authentic the report which was circulated of his last dying speech and confession, *but the will must make their labour vain.*"

When the life of Thomas Cromwell is undertaken by some honest and conscientious author, a fresh flood of light will be poured upon the transactions connected with the monastic visitations—the men selected, the instructions they received, and the reports produced. Whoever that writer may be, he will find in the British Museum and Public Record Office, a large number of memoranda, notes, and letters in Cromwell's own handwriting, together with other MSS., which will fully establish the monstrous injustice perpetrated by him as minister of the Crown. Mr. Tytler, who examined some of these documents many years ago, remarked that they exhibit Cromwell as "equally tyrannical and unjust, despising the authority of the law, and unscrupulous in the use of torture." How much worse would have been the opinion of this honest and fearless historian had he perused all the proofs now at hand on this question ?

In addition, it may be observed that only some months subsequently, at the execution of the venerable and queenly Countess of Salisbury, so unnaturally condemned by Henry<sup>2</sup>, was so fearful a scene witnessed as

<sup>2</sup> Although the Countess of Salisbury had been sentenced to death, it may be said at the instance of Cromwell, she lay a prisoner in the Tower, whilst the man who had procured her condemnation fell from his high place, and anticipated at his own execution the horrors which characterized hers. Thus the destroyer preceded the victim.

at the death of Cromwell himself. Two unskilful heads-men are described as “chopping his neck and head,” for nearly half-an-hour, his blood flowing profusely along the scaffold, whilst the “multitude danced and shouted in the frantic excitement of mingled joy and horror.” An awful spectacle! The hour of retribution had arrived; and Thomas Cromwell, who had attended so many executions, to witness the torture and insult his victims, was thus terribly summoned before the Supreme Judge.

About the time of Lord Cromwell’s execution, the scaffold and the stake daily presented the most revolting scenes. Barnes, Gerard, and Gerome, consigned to the stake as Reformers, were carried to the place of execution on hurdles; and along with them was placed on each hurdle a Papal Catholic, who was hanged and quartered for denying the King’s spiritual supremacy. Abel, Featherstone, and Powell, who were of the olden creed, declared that the most grievous part of the punishment was that of being “drawn on the same hurdle with such men as Barnes and his companions<sup>3</sup>.” A Portuguese nobleman, then in London, remarked that those who were against the Pope were burnt, and those who were for him were hanged. Richard Fetherstone, above named, was one of Katherine of Arragon’s chaplains, and the manager of her cause on the divorce trial. “His conduct at the scaffold,” says a contemporary, “commanded the sympathy of the Reformers committed to the fire near to the spot at which he suffered. He ascended the scaffold courageously and died grandly.” John Bale represents him as “a man of considerable learning, and the author of some interesting

<sup>3</sup> Sanders, Herbert, Hume (folio edit.), vol. iii. p. 244.

ballads, which seemed also destined for the fire," as they likewise were destroyed.

#### EFFECTS OF THE CONFISCATION ON THE PEOPLE.

THE monks were the great cultivators of the soil of England—their lands the main element of food production. The cultivation of the land, which theretofore had employed and maintained, not in superfluity, but with all necessaries, the great bulk of the people, was suddenly suspended. Thousands, most likely millions, of acres which had been under the plough from time out of mind, were all at once converted to pasture, to meet the new and increasing demand for English wool. The extravagant habits of the land-owning classes rendered them only too glad to welcome any change which would tend to relieve them from their momentary difficulties, and give them the means to procure fresh pleasures, and to indulge in new fancies. So the ploughs were banished from the farms, and with them the ploughmen and their families, and all who had passed their years in tilling the soil. What had been populous and thriving hamlets and villages, and busy towns, were, in a short time, converted into wastes. *The cottages were pulled down, and the churches turned into shelters for the sheep, which now roamed in vast flocks over what had been the busy haunts of men.* Landlords were accused of practising more than Eastern tyranny, which compelled honest householders to become followers of less honest men's tables; which brought honest matrons to the "needy rock and cards;" which compelled "men-children of good hope in the liberal sciences, and other honest qualities, whereof the

land had great lack," to labour at menial occupations that they might "sustain their parents' decrepit age and miserable poverty." Froward children shook off the yoke of godly authority, and ran headlong into all kinds of wickedness, finally "garnishing gallowe trees;" modest and chaste virgins, lacking a dowry, were compelled to pass their days in servitude, or else "to marry to perpetual miserable poverty;" while the immodest and the wanton became the denizens of Bankside, ending their miserable lives in the streets. Universal destruction was said to have befallen "this noble realm, by this outrageous and unsatiable desire of the surveyors of lands<sup>4</sup>."

The King was so constantly employed in hanging, drawing, and quartering, often for "conscience-sake," occasionally varying the order by substituting par-boiling and boiling as a change<sup>5</sup>, we need not wonder that thieves received little thought and less pity from those who were the arbiters of life and death. It must have been, to men less hardened than they who played so prominent a part in these scenes, a horrible and ghastly sight to behold, wherever they turned their eyes, the awful evidences of the brutal cruelty of the law. Along the river were suspended the bodies of men and women who had been guilty of foul play to foreigners. Tower Hill must have been one ooze of mud, mingled and streaked with the blood of the victims who there yielded up their lives to the fury of a King whose thirst for gore could never be slaked.

<sup>4</sup> "An Informacion and Peticion agaynst the Oppressions of the Pore Commons of this Realme," 1543.

<sup>5</sup> See "Chronicle of the Grey Friars," p. 35; also statuto condemning poisoners to be boiled in oil, which statutes were carried out in ten cases.

And Tyburn, with its never-ending streams of victims, who escaped the axe at Tower-hill, or the fires of Smithfield, only to wind their slow and painful way from the various prisons of London, there to be hanged, and the hanging to be followed by the revolting dismembering, that their yet quivering limbs and heads, with the features scarcely set in death, might garnish a city gate till they putrified and dropped, mingling with the mud and filth of the highway<sup>6</sup>.

And how fared the social state at this juncture? Dicing and carding ruined many an heir, and brought wealthy men to beggary. In Latimer's time, he tells us, there were more dicing houses than had ever been, where young men "played and lost all they possessed." The King passed an Act for the suppression of gaming-houses, and it was even threatened to punish carders and dicers in the same mode as robbers and adulterers. But all in vain: every vice was practised with augmented zest when all the restraints of a genuine morality and a true church were removed. But the law's visitation of socially-harmful sin was by no means impartial. If a poor man supplemented a wife by a mistress, or if his wife "played the harlot," they were "punished as they deserved." But, we are informed, an alderman, a gentleman, or a wealthy man, might keep one mistress or more, and "justice stayed her hand," and permitted them to go unpunished. "London deserved a thousand times more plagues than ever fell upon Tyre and Sidon, or even on Sodom and Gomorrah<sup>7</sup>." And this state of things befell in a few brief

<sup>6</sup> "The Lamentacyon of a Christen agaynst ye Cytte of London," &c., 1542.

<sup>7</sup> "Chronicle of the Grey Friars," p. 36.

years after the plunder of the religious houses, and the death or dispersion of the clergy and religious.

Winslow states that the alms which the monks dealt, and the hospitality which they maintained “every man knoweth.” “Many thousands were well relieved of them, and might have been better, if they had not had so many great men’s horses to feed, and had not been overcharged with such idle gentlemen, as were never out of abbeys. But now that the abbeys, with all their lands, goods, and impropriated parsonages, be in temporal men’s hands, I do not hear tell that one halfpenny worth of alms, or any other profit cometh unto the people of those parishes where such parsonages and vicarages be. Now where twenty pound was given yearly to the poor in more than a hundred places in England, is not one meal’s meat given. This is a fair amendment<sup>8</sup>.”

The industrious poor who had “furrowed the soil and made it fertile for the multitude,” were driven from their homes—“turned out of their shrouds like mice”—men and women, husbands and wives, fatherless children, woful mothers with their babes, small in substance, but many in number—whither should they go, ousted, as in the long subsequent melancholy stampedes in the sister isle for so many generations? “Without a resting-place, compelled to sell their small stock of goods for what they would bring, they wandered from town to town, from shire to shire, with no remedy but to steal and be hanged, or to beg and get cast into prison, to be ‘pinched,’ racked, and whipped, as vagabonds whom no man would set to work<sup>9</sup>. Such outcasts must have doubled the

<sup>8</sup> “The Complaynt of Roderyck Mors,” lf. 29.

<sup>9</sup> B. Gilpin’s Sermons, p. 33.

number of idle and sick poor, who had lost the charity on which they depended when the monasteries were suppressed. To endeavour to hide their poverty from the grieving eyes of the country—perhaps hoping to find some redress for the cruel hardships which they had to bear—these sad bands of the evicted turned their faces towards London, which was “one of the flowers of the world touching worldly riches.” London yet had the “true image of Christ”—the poor, the sick, the blind, the lame, and prisoners in abundance. “There were poor people innumerable, who were forced to go from door to door, or to sit openly begging in the streets, while many, unable to move out of the houses, lay and died because the rich did not aid them. Those who obtained office in the City spent their riches upon noblemen, aldermen, and rich commoners, heedless of the suffering and starvation around them, or heeding them only so far as to send a few scraps and bones to Newgate<sup>1</sup>.” “Every day the people famished in consequence of the misappropriation of the funds of religious houses<sup>2</sup>.” When Crowley thought of these innumerable able-bodied poor, and the alleys in which they huddled at night, “it made his heart weep<sup>3</sup>.” And well it might, to see these poor, feeble, blind, halt, lame, sickly old fathers, poor widows, and young children, mingling with the idle and dissembling vagabonds, and creeping about the miry streets of London and Westminster, picking up a precarious living by day, and perchance enough to pay their lodgings in those horrible alleys which merchants owned, and from which they derived considerable rents<sup>4</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> “The Lamentacyon,” &c., lf. 9. <sup>2</sup> “Crowley’s Epigrams,” lf. 5.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. 7.

<sup>4</sup> “Crowley’s Epigrams,” lf. 7.

The mendicancy caused by the confiscation of the monastic houses, was met by an amended code of “whipping,” “ear-cutting,” “pinching,” and an “improved specimen” of the pillory invented by Cromwell’s brother. A licence for begging was granted by a statute drawn up, it is said, by the King himself; but there is reason to believe that it was the work of Audley and Cromwell. By this act all magistrates and mayors were enjoined to make diligent search and inquiry of all aged poor and impotent persons, “who live, or of necessity be compelled to live, by alms of the charity of the people.” . . . “All such persons are to be licensed to beg within certain appointed districts, and if found begging in any other place than that to which they are licensed, they are to be punished by imprisonment in the stocks for two days and two nights, receiving only bread and water (a small quantity) for their sustenance during that time”—severe treatment for men and women averaging from sixty-five to seventy years of age, many of whom were lame or blind monks and nuns. Those who were found begging “without a due licence to do the same,” were punished with far greater severity. “He shall be stripped naked from the middle upwards, and whipped within the town in which he be found, or within some other town, as it shall seem good;” or if it be not convenient so to punish him, “if a culprit be too old or infirm, he shall be set in the stocks for the space of three days and three nights.” Let the reader bear in mind, that even if those unhappy people were able to labour there was no labour to be had; for a general stagnation in agriculture as well as commerce, followed the monastic confiscations. The “beggars who were well able to work” met a worse

fate. “They were to be sent to the nearest market town, or other town, or village, and there to be tied to the end of a cart, naked, and to be beaten with strong whips throughout the same town, till their bodies become bloody by reason of the same mentioned whipping<sup>5</sup>.” After this barbarous punishment the victim was sent to the place where he had been “commanded to reside”—and where, possibly, there was no employment—“and if,” said the Statute, “he do not there work for his bread, he shall be again and again whipped, till he getteth his living truly by the sweat of his brow.” Another class of beggars were to be “slightly scourged on two days, and on the third day to be placed upon a pillory, from nine of the clock till eleven of the same day; and to have the right ear of the said lazy beggar cut off;” and if the “said beggar offend the third time, to be again whipped and placed in the pillory, and to have the other ear cut off.” For a further violation of the mendicancy law, the penalty was to “die on the public scaffold as a felon and an enemy to the commonwealth.” It not unfrequently occurred that many of the men who underwent some of these punishments were scholars of Cambridge or Oxford, “decayed book-worms,” who were turned out to make room for men of the “new learning;” others were classic monks, who spent thirty and forty years translating Greek, Latin, and Hebrew manuscripts. “Tie the holy thieves<sup>6</sup> to the cart to be whipped naked till they fall to labour,” was the language used by the agents of the executive of

<sup>5</sup> Statutes of Henry the Eighth’s reign. The law was carried out in every instance, and with, if possible, more inhuman cruelty than the Statute designed.

<sup>6</sup> “The Holy Thieves” was the term adopted from Fish’s “Supplycacyon of Beggers.”

those times. What a strange recommendation to a country of a new religion, ushered in and followed by such a state of things !

There was another class of persons more “dangerous to the State” than the “swineish brutes,” or the “holy thieves”—namely, the disemployed servants of the abbeys and convents—the masons, joiners, smiths, bakers, labourers, together with a vast number of small tenants, who were dispossessed by the new landlords. These men averred hardily that they would neither beg nor starve. When connected with the religious houses these people were temperate and well-conducted. Driven to destitution by a rapacity so unexpected and general, they became furious, and joined in bands, seizing the flocks of the nobles and gentry, despoiling mansions, and levying contributions, wherever possible, on the agricultural and commercial classes. They also plundered the secular clergy, whom they accused of cowardice and collusion with the Crown, against their “good friends the monks.” They infested the highways day and night, and on the approach of danger took refuge in the woods. They showed no pity to the few new proprietors who fell into their hands, and far less mercy was bestowed upon themselves when captured by the landholders or the irregular troops of the King. The next tree and a rope, or the sudden steel, were all the ceremonials used for their disposal—no form of law or trial. The King ordered proclamation to be made that “all highwaymen be hanged on the nearest tree, as a warning to the followers of those lazy rogues called monks<sup>7</sup>.” On one occasion some two hundred

<sup>7</sup> “Royal Proclamations;” “Condition of the Realm;” State Papers of Henry VIIith’s Reign.

starving men attacked six cartloads of provisions belonging to the King; a fierce struggle took place between the guard of the convoy and their hungry assailants, who succeeded in carrying off the spoil. On the following day fifty of the highwaymen were captured, and at once “hanged without benefit of clergy<sup>8</sup>.” These scenes continued—despairing famine contending hopelessly against the might of armed wealth—until the steel, the gibbet, and the prison plague decimated and transformed and subjugated a people who for centuries had stood pre-eminent for their moral qualities, their sturdy independence, and their social comfort. Alas! it would seem, from its very inception, that the “Church of England,” and the Church of God in England, were sadly different things.

#### THE COUNTESS OF SALISBURY.

TOWARDS the close of 1539 the dark chambers of the Tower and the Fleet received some illustrious prisoners who were doomed for the headsman or the gibbet. The Marquis of Exeter, and Lord Montague, who was brother to Reginald Pole, were consigned to the Tower; and on the following day Sir Edward Neville and several others were arrested; next was the venerable Countess of Salisbury, then nearly seventy years of age. The usual charges of high treason were preferred against all the prisoners. It was alleged that they joined in a plot to “assassinate the King’s Highness, and to raise Reginald Pole to the throne by a marriage with the Princess Mary.” “Witnesses and docu-

<sup>8</sup> Roger Radcliff’s “Changed Times in the Countrie Parts.”

mentary evidence" were produced—indeed the organizing skill of Chancellor Audley and Thomas Cromwell seldom failed in producing these "essentials to a just conclusion," to use the words of Andley himself. Lords Exeter and Montague, Sir Edward Neville, two friars, and four persons of less note were all arraigned, found guilty, and speedily executed. Then the case of the "grand old Countess" succeeded. Distinguished for the best and most amiable qualities suited to adorn her sex and station, her treatment raised an almost universal sentiment of sympathy. "She appears," observes Turner, "to have been a woman with a Roman mind, as to firmness, dignity, and fortitude." All her contemporaries speak of her as a woman of noble, generous, and kindly nature. Whiting states that there was "no such noble dame in all the land as the Countess of Salisbury." She was not condemned to death for four months after her son and other relatives perished on the scaffold. The Earl of Southampton and the Bishop of Ely were commanded by Lord Cromwell to arrest the Countess of Salisbury. The report they made to Cromwell "on the matter with which they were charged" exhibits the bearing and character of this illustrious lady.

"Yesterday (Nov. 13) we travelled with the Lady Salisbury till almost night. She would utter and confess little or nothing more than the first day she did, but she still stood and persisted in the denial of all. This day, although we entreated her sometimes with mild words, and now roughly and asperly, by traitoring her and her sons to the ninth degree, yet would she nothing utter, but utterly denieth all that is objected unto her. We suppose that there hath not been seen

or heard of a woman so earnest, so manlike in countenance. We must needs deem that her sons have not made her privy nor participant of the bottom and pit of their stomachs, or else she is the most arrant traitress that ever was seen.” . . . The Commissioners then describe the plans they adopted to “ affright her :” they found “ some bulls and other documents,” which proved her sympathies to be rather with the Pope than with the King. They describe her resolute bearing during the “ investigation, searching, and journey.” “ We assure your lordship we have dealed with such a one as men have not dealed with all before us. We may call her rather a strong and constant man than a woman : for, in all behaviour, howsoever we have used her, she hath showed herself so earnest, vehement, and precise, that more could not be<sup>9</sup>.”

Lord Cromwell despatched a note to the King containing his own opinion of the “ traitress.” “ She,” the Countess, “ hath been examined ; and in effect she pretendeth ignorance and no knowledge of the person that should report the tale. . . . I shall never cease untill the bottom of her stomach may be clearly opened and disclosed.” But the Countess confessed no treason ; had nothing to confess, to use her own words, but that her “ first allegiance was due to the Church ; the second to the throne and the realm<sup>10</sup>.” She possessed all the pride and courage of the Plantagenets.

There is no record extant of the exact charges made against the Countess of Salisbury, but it is understood that she was condemned for high treason. She re-

<sup>9</sup> MS. Cal., D. 11.

<sup>10</sup> Ellis, Royal Letters, pp. 112, 114, 115 ; Strype’s “ Mem.” p. 521 ; Sharon Turner, vol. x.

mained a prisoner in the Tower for more than two years, during which period she suffered incredible privations. “Want of warm clothing in winter; placed in a damp cell without fire; no bed covering; a small quantity of bad food daily; added to this the frequent and untimely visits of those ‘men of iron heart and grosser conduct’—the warders.” To use her own words, she “was allowed one privilege, for which she was grateful, and valued more than fine dishes or good fires—namely, her Latin Prayer Book and her golden Crucifix<sup>1</sup>.”

The Marchioness of Exeter was impeached at the same time with Lady Salisbury, but was pardoned.

Sharon Turner states that Henry “was not willing to take the Countess’s life.” But it is difficult to reconcile this statement with the circumstances of the case. After nearly two years’ confinement in the Tower (27th May), Lady Salisbury was informed that the King had issued his final order for her execution. “The King ordered,” says Lord Herbert, “that the Countess of Salisbury should be carried to the place of execution, as she was unable to walk, from the long suffering she had endured in a damp cell.” When the Countess reached the scaffold she seemed to have recovered much of her pristine energy of body and mind. When ordered to prepare for the block she refused, and with the proud bearing of a Plantagenet, said, “I have committed no crime, I have had no trial. If you cut off my head, then you shall take it as best you can.” “Running about the scaffold she resisted the executioners, who

<sup>1</sup> “English Matrons in the Tower and on the Scaffold.” Printed in Brussels A.D. 1561. The author of this little book was the gifted Blanche Varney, one of the exiled nuns of Shaftesbury.

pursued her with enormous knives or hatchets in hand, making dreadful blows at her neck, until she fell covered with wounds, and her long white hair and her hands were bathed with her life-blood. Finally her head having been cut off was held up to the gaze of the multitude<sup>2</sup>.

The following is Echard's description of the execution:—"This old lady, who was seventy years of age, being brought to the scaffold erected in the Tower, was commanded to lay her head on the block, but she positively refused, saying, 'So should traitors do, but I am none.' Nor did it avail that the executioner told her that it was always customary to do so; but turning her grey head every way she cried out, 'If you will have my head, get it as best you can.' So the executioner was constrained to take her head off barbarously<sup>3</sup>." Dodd and his contemporaries have accepted this account of the scene on the scaffold. Reginald Pole states that the last words of the Countess were, "Blessed are those who suffer persecution for righteousness' sake<sup>4</sup>." Mr. Froude questions Lord Herbert's statement as to the scene on the scaffold, although Hall, Burnet, Hume, and several other writers have regarded and chronicled it as a fact. Mr. Froude attributes, like Sharon Turner, every description of political intrigue and treason to the aged Countess, but with no better evidence than that adjudged against those illustrious personages who preceded her to the scaffold.

"The manlike Margaret Plantagenet," writes Mr. Froude, "would have disdained and disclaimed indul-

<sup>2</sup> Lord Herbert's Life of Henry VIII.

<sup>3</sup> Echard's "Hist. of Eng.," vol. ii. p. 293.

<sup>4</sup> Reg. Pole, vol. iii. p. 76.

gence on the plea of her sex, so that treason of women in the sixteenth century was no more considered to be entitled to immunity than their participation in grosser crimes is held in the nineteenth century. . . . A settled age can imperfectly comprehend an age of revolution, or realize the indifference with which men risk their own blood and shed the blood of others when battling for a great cause<sup>5</sup>.” What was the “great cause?”

Lady Salisbury was a countess in her own right, and historians have described her under the various names connected with her family. She was the daughter of George, Duke of Clarence, and Isabel Nevil, the eldest daughter of Richard, Earl of Warwick, “the setter-up and puller-down of Kings.” The Countess was also the niece of Edward IV., and first cousin of Elizabeth of York, subsequently mother of Henry VIII., and consequently related to the King himself. Her brother, the Earl of Warwick, was impeached and beheaded, his only offence consisting in the fact of a close relationship to the crown. The family received several warnings from Henry VII., whose suspicious mind was ever jealous of a Plantagenet. Margaret was compelled by Henry VII. to marry a Welsh knight named Richard de la Pole, by whom she had a large family, and “lived in love and peace.” Her husband is described by a chronicle of the times “as a chivalrous knight and a good-natured man, who was much esteemed at court, and respected by the people.” In Henry VIIth’s reign Lady Salisbury was placed in charge of the Royal children; so that Henry VIII. had known her almost from his infancy. On the arrival of the Infanta (Katherine) from Spain, the Countess “con-

<sup>5</sup> Froude’s “Hist. of England,” vol. iv.

ducted and arranged the young Princess's household." A feeling of mutual friendship sprang up between the lady companion and the Princess when Katherine was married to Prince Arthur; the Countess was still attached to her household at Ludlow at the period of Arthur's death, and was with her during a great portion of her widowhood; was present at her marriage with Henry; stood amongst the noble ladies who thronged around the King and Queen at their coronation; when the Princess Mary was baptized the royal infant was held at the font by Lady Salisbury; and again, at the confirmation of Mary, she appeared as what Queen Katherine styled her "the old family friend." At this period Henry was much attached, or affected to be so, to his kinswoman. He visited the royal nursery almost daily, and conversed freely with her; he listened with pleasure to her tales about his own days of childhood; he had perhaps heard of the sonnets written on the historical Margaret Plantagenet when styled the "Maid of the Golden Tresses." Time rolled on, and the "Maid of the Golden Tresses" became a feeble old woman, with snow-white hair, and was impeached for treason, a prisoner in the Tower—next, on the scaffold defying the headsman, in the strength of her innocence, and royally meeting her death at the command of that kinsman whom she had nursed in childhood, and to whose own offspring she had accorded almost a mother's care. Honour, justice, manliness, all the kindly ties of humanity were violated by this cruel deed of Henry Tudor.

## LADYE LATYMORE.

CATHERINE, the widow of Lord Latymore, was selected by Henry to become his sixth wife. It is said this lady had the courage to tell him "that it was safer to be his concubine than his wife." He was, however, so little offended at this observation that he pursued his suit with characteristic impetuosity. Catherine had been twice married, and at this time contemplated a third match with a former lover, Sir Thomas Seymour, which ambition set aside for a time, and the "Adonis of the Court vanished from the scene." But three months intervened between the proving of her late husband's will and the marriage of Catherine with the King. Archbishop Cranmer, as commanded, issued a licence for the marriage, "to be performed in whatever church, chapel, or oratory, it might please his Highness the King to have his marriage celebrated." The marriage took place on Thursday, the 10th of July, 1543, at Hampton Court Palace. Stephen Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, performed the ceremony, but with much reluctance; he dared not, however, refuse. This "sixth queen" of Henry is historically known as Catherine Parr, and holds a prominent place amongst Miss Strickland's heroines of the Reformation epoch. The "piety and learning" attributed to her by Miss Strickland, would be somewhat marvellous, if true. Catherine Parr was the patroness, if not the instigator, of many questionable intrigues to promote the Reformation, which were openly avowed on the death of the King. Her duplicity in religious matters was perfect: she attended mass with the King; her

chaplains, publicly celebrating Catholic ceremonies, privately attended her Protestant parties. What good cause could or should be promoted by deceit like this; or how can any honest pen defend such double-faced dishonour, unless the defence be grounded on that long-standing falsehood alleged against an illustrious order—"The end sanctifies the means"? Cranmer, Poynet, Coverdale, Bale, Jewell, Barlow, and Parker, were amongst Catherine Parr's clerical advisers. She was also surrounded by the Seymours, the Herberts, the Russells, the Dudleys, the Hobys, the Throckmortons, and all those men and women who played a part in the sad scenes of the reigns of Edward and Mary. Anon the reader will see more of the policy of this Queen Consort.

#### THE CHURCH AND THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.

THOUGH learning began to make considerable strides, amongst a select class of inquirers, in the reign of Henry, the education of the nobles seemed to have been none, or, if a little, worthless. They were mostly brought up in hunting, dicing, hawking, and card-playing, in eating and drinking—in all pastime and pleasure. "Such things alone were thought to pertain to the proper office of a gentleman, as though he were born thereto and nothing else<sup>6</sup>." They neglected the more manly accomplishments, and "sold their lands to squander the money they fetched in gaming<sup>7</sup>." Born,

<sup>6</sup> "England in the Reyne of Henry VIII." by Starkey, Chaplain to the King, p. 129.

<sup>7</sup> "The Ruyne of a Realme;" "Ballads from MSS.," ed. F. G. Furnivall, Esq., M.A., i. 159.

as they thought, only that they might spend what their ancestors had acquired, they fulfilled none of the duties belonging to their position, or only performed them imperfectly. If they were not apparelled in silks and velvets they fancied “they lacked honour<sup>8</sup>.” Three of the “most ignorant men in England,” of their time, were the most influential peers—namely, the Dukes of Buckingham and Suffolk, and the Marquis of Dorset. To use the words of a contemporary, “they were very unbooklearned.” Even so late as Edward the Sixth’s reign there were several peers who could neither read nor write; and most of the squires were in a similarly unlettered condition. When such was the mental status of the nobility, it is easy to estimate the enlightenment of the people, and their ability to avail themselves of newly-printed books.

In no matter connected with the Catholic Church in England has there been more persistent misrepresentation than in the accusation that the Church withheld the Bible from the people. The evidence of eminent Anglican divines on this subject is welcome and important. The Rev. Mr. Blunt writes: “There has been much wild and foolish writing about the scarcity of the Bible in the ages preceding the Reformation. It has been taken for granted that the Holy Scripture was almost a sealed book to clergy and laity until it was printed in English by Tyndale and Coverdale, and that the only real source of knowledge respecting it before then was the translation made by Wickliffe. The facts are that the clergy and monks were daily reading large portions of the Bible, and had them stored up in their memory by constant recitation; that they made very

<sup>8</sup> “England in the Reign of Henry VIII.,” p. 130.

free use of Holy Scripture in preaching, so that even a modern Bible reader is astonished at the number of quotations and references contained in Mediæval sermons; *that countless copies of the Bible were written out by the surprising industry of cloistered scribes*; that many glosses or commentaries were written which are still to be seen full of pious and wise thoughts, and that all laymen *who could read* were, as a rule, provided with their Gospels, their Psalter, or other devotional portions of the Bible. Men did, in fact, take a vast amount of *personal* trouble with respect to the production of copies of the Holy Scriptures; and accomplished by head, hands, and heart, what is now chiefly done by paid workmen and machinery. *The clergy studied the Word of God, and made it known to the laity; and those few among the laity who could read had abundant opportunity of reading the Bible, either in Latin or in English, up to the Reformation period.* . . . Fair historical research will convince any investigator who is open to conviction that God has always had a large army of faithful servants engaged in making known—some in one way, some in another—the Word which He has revealed. . . . Notwithstanding the immense destruction of manuscripts by the English Puritans, there still exist many vernacular Gospels, Psalters, and complete Bibles, of dates ranging from the ninth to the sixteenth centuries, relics that bear witness to extensive labours, of which devouring time and fanatic ignorance have spared but a representative portion. The earliest of these translations known to us now is one of the Psalters by Aldhelm, Bishop of Sherborne (A.D. 656—709). The Venerable Bede (A.D. 672—735) made a translation, the extent of which is not recorded; but on

the evening of his death he was engaged in finishing the Gospel of St. John by the aid of an amanuensis. King Alfred (A.D. 849—941) is said to have translated the whole Bible; and it is certain that he executed some portions of such a translation. In the British Museum there is a magnificent English copy of the Gospels, called the “Durham Book,” which is not more recent than the time of King Alfred; and there is another of the same age in the Bodleian Library at Oxford; a Psalter of the same period is in the Chapter library at Salisbury (in Latin and Anglo-Saxon), and a book of the Gospels of rather a later date, in Corpus Christi library, Cambridge; and doubtless many more known to those familiar with our manuscript treasures. Although these facts have been much lost sight of during the last three centuries, by all except antiquarians, they were well known at the period of the Reformation<sup>9</sup>.”

Becon (an early Reformer) and John Foxe contend that Latimer was always, even while a Papist, in favour of the Scriptures being given to the “common people” to read. Henry Wharton, however, proves those statements to be untrue. He says Latimer was far from maintaining such a doctrine. “In fact he joined with Archbishop Wareham, and other prelates and divines, in condemning all English translations of the Scripture; and Latimer solemnly subscribed this determination. Here are Father Latimer’s words:—‘The publication of the Holy Scriptures in the vulgar tongue *is not necessary for Christians; and the King’s Highness and the Bishops of England do well in forbidding to the*

<sup>9</sup> Rev. J. H. Blunt “On the Reformation of the Church of England,” vol. i. p. 505.

people the common use of the Holy Scriptures in the English tongue<sup>1</sup>?'" Latimer made this public declaration about 1530; and he maintained the same opinions for many years subsequently. Strype goes back to the days of the Archbishop Arundel (1392) to prove that that prelate was in favour of the Scriptures being translated into the "vulgar tongue for the use of the people." Henry Wharton, who spent a lifetime amongst episcopal MSS. and Diocesan records, holds the opposite opinion. In 1693 Wharton writes to Strype on this question. "So far," he says, "from Archbishop Arundelavouring the translation of the Scriptures into the vulgar tongue, or the use of them by the laity, that, in the year 1408, he made the following famous decree in the synod of Oxford: '*Periculosa res est, &c.* It is a dangerous thing to translate the Holy Scriptures. We decree, therefore, and ordain, that henceforth no man by his own authority do translate any book or Holy Scriptures into the English, or any other tongue, by way of book, libel, or treatise; and that no such book or translation be read by any one, upon pain of the higher excommunication<sup>2</sup>.'" Let us explain this decree. It was not because the Church was opposed to the diffusion of the Sacred Word. Why should she be so, since that Word is the manifestation of her truth and immortality? But what she would not, and will not, suffer, is, that this living Word should be left, like a profane text, to every unauthorized commentator; that every man who pleased might

<sup>1</sup> Strype's "Cranmer," vol. ii. p. 1059; Wharton's "Observations on Strype's Memorials."

<sup>2</sup> Strype's "Cranmer," vol. ii. p. 1060; Wharton's "Observations on Strype."

give his own meaning or version, and that the translator, whether resting or not on the faith of Jesus Christ, should experiment on it as if it were a mere human production, and expose to the world his follies and his doubts ; that the Word of God should be treated like a papyrus just discovered, and hitherto unexplained. “ Writing,” as Plato says, “ is not like speech : speech can explain itself, but writing cannot.” The Word has spoken by the lips of the fathers, the doctors, and the martyrs of the new law. Did not the conduct of the heresiarchs justify the Church in her care of the Divine Word ? What would have been its lot had not the Church from the earliest ages watched over this sacred deposit ? We can judge from the individual efforts of post-Reformation translators of various portions of the Scriptures, which manifest all the gradations from crassest blunders and false assumptions, down to hopeless atheism.

The Lollards were in their time zealous in producing fragmentary translations of the Scripture, whence they preached and justified levelling principles, like those of the recent French Commune, respecting the “ rights of man.” An incapable or dishonest man, it has been said, can wrench out of the Bible, somewhere or other, something to suit his purpose ; and Joe Smith, the founder of Mormonism, pleads the example of the Patriarchs for his polygamy. That the Lollards made a self-suitable version is probable enough, to judge by their proceedings. The opinion held of them by the most virtuous monarch (Henry VI.) that occupied the English throne from the Conquest, is of interest, as being very little known, and, at the same time, very true. In 1431 this King wrote, “ God knoweth never

would they (the Lollards) be subject to His laws nor to man's laws, but would be *loose and free to rob, rove, and despoil, slay and destroy all men of thrift and worship* (religion), as they proposed to have done in our father's days; and of lads and lurdains they would make lords<sup>3</sup>." Dean Hook and other recent writers have arrived at the conclusion that the Lollards, under plea of being religious Reformers, were in reality political incendiaries and social disturbers.

Hume contends that Tyndale's translations of the Scriptures were "greedily read by the people<sup>4</sup>"; and another writer of high repute describes Archbishop Cranmer and Lord Cromwell presenting the first Bible to a "pious multitude of men, women, and children, thirsting after the Word of God." Foxe, Burnet, Speed, Strype, Brady, Carte, Leland, Echard, Oldmixon, Rapin, Turner, and several others, have made statements to the same effect, leading their readers to the signally mistaken impression that the people *could* read. The Rev. Mr. Blunt, however, who deals with facts, takes a different view, and exhibits also the evil effects of false expositions of the Bible upon the masses, who heard, but did not read, and were thus in the hands of the designing, the dishonest, or the incapable. Mr. Blunt says, "The lawless political principles of Wickliffe<sup>5</sup>, and still more lawless ones of his followers, created a strong prejudice against vernacular translations of the Scripture on the part of the rulers of Eng-

<sup>3</sup> "Archæologia," vol. xxiii. p. 339.

<sup>4</sup> Hume's "Hist. of England," vol. iii. p. 224.

<sup>5</sup> Mr. Froude represents this revolutionary heretic (John Wickliffe) "as a man of most simple life, austere in appearance, with bare feet and russet mantle" (Froude's "Hist. of England," vol. ii. p. 14).

land, both in Church and State. The *Bible was quoted in support of rebellion and of the wildest heresy.* Even Archbishop Cranmer refers to, and condemns, a class of persons who ‘slandered and hindered the Word of God.’” Every man of learning in the country, with few exceptions, protested against the mutilation of the Scriptures by ignorant and dishonest men. In 1526 Archbishop Wareham complained of translations made of the Scriptures by the Lutherans, “*instilling pernicious and scandalous heresies into the minds of the simple, and profaning the hitherto unsullied majesty of the Holy Scriptures by extraordinary and distorted commentaries*<sup>6</sup>.” The first edition of Tyndale’s Bible was condemned by the English Church for its errors, and the second edition multiplied the faults of the first. The second edition was printed at Cologne, but before it reached England Archbishop Wareham purchased up the whole number, in order that it might not “lead the people astray”<sup>7</sup>.

Of this transaction the Rev. Mr. Blunt writes, “There was much justification for the Archbishop’s conduct by the ‘prologues,’ the ‘glosses,’ and the false renderings of Tyndale’s translation—the first alone occupying as much space as the translation itself; but no doubt Archbishop Wareham was one of those for whom the excuse should be made which Cranmer wrote in his preface to the ‘great Bible.’” All the eminent theologians of the time found fault with Tyndale’s translations. In 1525 Dr. Lee, one of the most

<sup>6</sup> Wilkin’s “Council,” iii. 706.

<sup>7</sup> Archbishop Wareham paid the Cologne publisher, for the edition intended to be consigned to England of Tyndale’s Bible, the sum of 66*l.* 9*s.* 4*d.*—nearly equal to 800*l.* of present currency (Ellis’s “Original Letters”).

distinguished divines of the English Church, wrote to Henry the Eighth on the evil consequences that must accrue to the country by the introduction of Tyndale's Bible. He called the King's attention to the evils inflicted upon the realm in former times when passages from the Scriptures were ignorantly or falsely rendered, and used by seditious knaves to the detriment of Church and State, to loosen the bonds of society, to lessen the respect due to the laws, to raise false ideas of men's rights and license, and to scoff at the observances of the olden faith<sup>8</sup>.

In some early editions of Tyndale's New Testament there are grave omissions, which might justly be regarded as wilful. We find in the printing of 1 Pet. ii. 13, 14, "Submit yourselves unto all manner of ordinance of man for the Lord's sake, whether it be unto rulers, as unto them that are sent of Him." . . . Here the words, "whether it be unto the king, or chief head," which appear in other editions, are altogether left out. "Such an error," writes the Rev. Mr. Blunt, "was quite enough justification for the suppression of Tyndale's translation<sup>9</sup>."

Those writers who assert the eagerness of the masses to embrace and peruse the newly-printed Bibles have forgotten any notice of the people's ability to do so. How many of the population of London or the large towns of England could read or write at the accession of Elizabeth? And we are now treating of Henry's reign. The lower classes, to an unit, most certainly could not, and those of the trading order "wrote some figures,

<sup>8</sup> Ellis's "Royal Letters" (3rd series), vol. ii. p. 71.

<sup>9</sup> See Edit. of 1531 and 1534, Douce, B. 226. 237, Bodl. Lib. The first an extremely rare copy.

read a little, but knew nothing of books.” Yet we are seriously told by a very recent writer, of such persons as “weavers, tailors, masons, and carpenters, going by stealth to read their newly-purchased Bibles”! Now, even if such parties could read—which most truly they could not—how could they afford to purchase the sacred tome? Their means were utterly inadequate, and their inclinations lay rather to invest the scant overplus from their daily requirements in the old “yale” which Philip of Spain designated the “strong English wine.” And there is very little question that the same class now-a-days would return a majority to imitate their ancestors’ example. But let us see how easy it must have been for those pious tailors and weavers to procure those Bibles which they could not read. At the end of Edward the Sixth’s reign John Spithonus was paid (as shown in the entries for the “chamber and robes” of the Princess Elizabeth) 1*l.* 7*s.* 4*d.*<sup>10</sup> for a copy of the Bible; and Edmund Allen had twenty shillings sterling for another copy, in which the “strangest typographical deficiencies” were apparent. The Bible, in fact, was never put together in England in a fairly readable shape, either in compilation or type, until the 9th and 10th James I.—the great majority of the printers in London being Germans or Italians forming one good reason for the prevailing and signal inaccuracy of all the earlier printed English books. When we remember that “skilled mechanics” had sixpence per day; inferior ditto, threepence per diem; mowers, three-halfpence to twopence; and labourers, one penny per day, “with their dinner”<sup>1</sup>, we may estimate the

<sup>10</sup> Book of Household Expenses of the Princess Elizabeth.

<sup>1</sup> See “Price of Corn,” in Toon’s “Chronological History.”

altitude of that flight of imagination which places books that, taking the relative value of money, must have cost 14*l.* or 15*l.*, in the hands of an utterly unlettered population, of whom the best workmen earned but sixpence a day !

Dean Hook does not seem to give much credence to the marvellous story of the “newly-purchased Bibles,” and we also find him observing that “much idle declamation has been wasted upon the dogmatic statements put forth that the Church prohibited the reading of the Scriptures.” On this important subject he remarks, “The study of the Scripture as a book of devotion was encouraged in all ages of the Church by divines; and from the time of Alfred translations were made for the edification of those who were unable to read the Bible in the original.” And again the reverend writer justly and significantly observes, “The idea of each man making a religion for himself out of the Bible is a modern notion, and must stand for what it is worth.” Does not this latter sentence prove the consciousness, in this distinguished Churchman, of the necessity of a higher order of educated intellect directing the common minds of men in the due appreciation and understanding of the sacred volume ? The Dean’s remark cuts like a two-edged sword at the self-confident but vague Episcopalian and Dissenting axiom—“Search the Scriptures”—to bestow upon each, no matter what the discrepancy of intellect, the perilous boon of a self-chosen faith. To permit the masses to “search the Scriptures,” without insisting upon the evident need of the search being directed towards the truth by the disciplined experience of the Doctors of the Church, would

<sup>2</sup> Hook’s “Archbishops of Canterbury,” vol. vi.

have been an impossible acquiescence in the dignitaries of a creed which claimed to be one and unchangeable, and to derive its origin from Christ Himself.

A portly volume could be filled with mere extracts from the diverse readings of free translators, some or others of whom garbled, misrepresented, or ignored many truths in the Bible. Here is an instance of the danger to which the Word is exposed by leaving it to the interpretation of every one. “Hail ! full of grace,” says the angel to the virgin when about to make his great revelation ; “*Kaiρε κεχαριτωμένη*,” says St. Luke ; “Ave gratiâ plena,” says the Vulgate ; “Ave gratis dilecta,” says Theodore Beza<sup>3</sup> ; “Ave gratiosa,” says Erasmus of Rotterdam<sup>4</sup> ; “Ave gratiam consecuta,” says Andrew Osiander the younger<sup>5</sup> ; “Who is received in grace,” says the New Testament<sup>6</sup> ; “Bist gegrüsset, du Begnadete,” says the Church of Zurich<sup>7</sup>. “Wretched translations !” exclaimed Luther. ““Hail Mary ! full of grace’! (‘gratiosa.’) What German booby has made an angel speak thus ? ‘Full of grace :’ as one would say of a pot, ‘full of beer,’ or of a purse, ‘full of money<sup>8</sup>.’ I have translated it, ‘Hail ! most Holy’ (‘du Holdselige’). My translation is the correct one : I shall have no Popish ass for my judge ; whoever rejects my version may go to the devil !” In 1523, a year after the appearance of his New Testament, Luther,

<sup>3</sup> In “Novo Testamento Graecè et Latinè,” ann. 1567, 1568.

<sup>4</sup> 1520. “Nov. Testamentum,” Basil.

<sup>5</sup> “Biblia Sacra,” Tubingæ, ann. MD.C. folio.

<sup>6</sup> Ann. 1587.

<sup>7</sup> Bible, printed at Zurich, ann. 1530, 8vo.

<sup>8</sup> “Welcher Deutscher versteht, was gesagt sey : voll Gnaden ? Er muss denken an ein Fass voll Bier, oder Beutel voll Geld.”—Oper. Luth., tom. iv. fol. 160.

forgetting his Satanic wish, translated it, in a “postil” on the angelic salutation, “And the angel came and said, ‘Hail Mary ! full of grace’ (‘Gegrüsset seyst du, Maria voller Gnaden<sup>9</sup>’).” We would not venture to give the commentary upon this passage subsequently made by Agricola, Luther’s disciple and successor in the administration of the Church of Wittemberg.

When the Church is once satisfied of the fidelity of an interpreter, we see how she acts. Bossuet distributed throughout France fifty thousand copies of Father Amelotte’s translation of the New Testament, and as many Prayer Books in the vernacular<sup>1</sup>. Protestants accuse the Catholics of having concealed the Word of God until the advent of Luther. Bossuet, in his “History of the Variations,” states that there were versions of the Scripture “for the use of Catholics centuries before the Reformation.” John Lefèvre d’Etaples had published, in 1523, his translation of the Bible, on which he had been engaged before even Luther’s name was known in France. Seckendorf tells us that German translations of the Bible had appeared at Wittemberg in 1477, 1483, and 1490, and at Augsburg in 1518<sup>2</sup>. But Italy anticipated all nations in elucidating the sacred text. Jacobus de Voragine, Bishop of Genoa, and author of the “Golden Legend,” translated the Bible into Italian about the end of the thirteenth century, nearly at the time when Dante was inditing his “Inferno.” At Venice, about 1421, Nicolo Malermi, or Malerbi, a Camaldulensian monk, translated the

<sup>9</sup> Oper. Luth. part ii. Jenæ, 1555, fol. 510, a.

<sup>1</sup> Robelot, “Influence de la Réformation,” p. 389.

<sup>2</sup> Seckendorf, “Comm. de Luther,” lib. 1, sect. li. § 125, p. 204.

Scriptures<sup>3</sup> so successfully, that his version was reprinted nine times in the fifteenth century, and nearly twenty times in the subsequent one<sup>4</sup>. Another monk, Guido, translated the four Gospels, with the commentaries of Simon de Cascia; and Federico of Venice published an exposition of the Apocalypse in 1394<sup>5</sup>. Finally, in 1530, Brucioli made a complete translation of the sacred books. It was to Brucioli that Aretino wrote, in 1537, "You are unequalled in the knowledge of the Hebrew, Greek, Latin, and Chaldee<sup>6</sup>." The poet might have added Italian, for Brucioli polished and improved that language. He was master of the idiom of Dante's epoch, as Luther was of the ancient Saxon. The Church, it may be added, condemned the work for imperfections, and Brucioli submitted.

And now for a brief glance on the effect which the Reformation had on the literature of Germany. Although the mighty agency of printing seemed invented for the hands of the Reformers, what became of that literature of which Dalberg, Scultetus, Albert, and Langus took such pious care in their dioceses before

<sup>3</sup> Fontanini, "Della Elog. Ital." p. 673. Dibdin mentions another translation which appeared in October, 1421, without name of printer or author (*Ædes Althorp.* tom. i. p. 44).—Bibl. Spencer, tom. i. p. 63.

<sup>4</sup> Foscarini, "Della Letteratura Veneziana," tom. i. p. 339.

<sup>5</sup> Li Quattro Volumini de gli Evangili Volgarizzati da Frate Guido con le loro Espozioni Fatte per Frate Simone de Cascia: Ven. 1486. L'Apocalisse con le Chiose de Nicolo da Lira, traslazione di Maestro Federico de Venezia, lavorata nel 1394, et stampata: Ven. 1519. Erasme del Signore Marchese Scipione Maffei, p. 19. Roveredo, 1739.

<sup>6</sup> Ergötzlichkeiten aus der Kirchenhistorie und Literatur, von Schelhorn. Mazzucchelli, Schritt. It. tom. ii. p. 4. Th. M'Crie, "History of the Progress and Suppression of the Reformation in Italy in the Sixteenth Century," p. 59, *et seq.*

the Reformation? It was either neglected or proscribed. Mark even the complaints of Luther's own disciples on the universal abandonment of the sciences, provoked by the religious and social disputes occasioned by the new Gospel in Germany. Eobanus Hessus deplores, with his friends, the fall of classical studies<sup>7</sup>; Glareanus reproaches the clergy of his school with making a parade of their ignorance<sup>8</sup>. Cuspinian, afflicted by seeing that Nuremberg, once the city of artists, thinks of nothing but pepper and saffron<sup>9</sup>, writes to Pirkheimer, "Mark my words; I foresee that, in a short while, the culture of learning will be extinguished. I had hoped that your patricians would have some regard to the ancient sciences; but I have been deceived. I shall go to sleep, like Epimenides, and throw all my poetic inspirations into the fire. Your school, which Melancthon raised, will not be left standing long<sup>1</sup>." Melancthon was a special sufferer by the banishment of literature from Wittemberg. The Elector forgot to pay him his salary as Professor of Humanity, and he lost his pupils daily—he whose chair had been previously surrounded by crowds of young men eager to hear his lectures<sup>2</sup>. Carl Hagen has drawn a noble picture of the condition of literature in Germany previous to the Reformation, in his "Deutschlands Litterarische und Religiöse Verhältnisse im Reformations-Zeitalter" (Erlangen, 1851, tom. i.). He describes the renown which had then been acquired

<sup>7</sup> Eobanus Hess on Jakob Mycillus, Sept. 1525, *Epist. Famil. Marb.* p. 42; to the same, 1526, *ibid.*; to John Groning, 1 Aug. 1532.

<sup>8</sup> Glareanus to Pirkheimer, 5 Sept., 1525. *Op. Pirk.* pp. 316, 317.

<sup>9</sup> Hess to Sturziades, p. 137; to Mycillus, *ibid.* p. 50. "Quid enim hic agamus inter tantum mercatores?"

<sup>1</sup> 25th Jan., 1527. *Op. Pirk.* p. 227.

<sup>2</sup> Strobel, *l.c.* tom. ii. pp. 184, 187.

by the German universities, the success with which literature had been cultivated, and the liberal efforts made by the Catholic clergy to utilize printing and diffuse education. And be it remembered, that Carl Hagen is not a Catholic. As to the Irish Church, more than one thousand years ago the Scriptures were translated into the mother tongue; and every abbey and convent had daily lectures on the Bible. There are still extant Irish sermons of a most remote period, filled with quotations from the Scriptures.

---

In 1543 Dr. London was committed to the Fleet for perjury. As the reader is aware, he was the organizer, under Cromwell, of the conspiracy against the monastic houses. Set as a spy upon the Reformers, he performed his despicable functions with falsehood and cruelty, and at last reached the dungeon in which so many of his victims had perished of neglect or prison fever. He remained in the Fleet for some time, a prey to remorse and despair, until his evil life ended amidst the contempt and hatred of all parties. His accomplice, Dean Layton, when on his death-bed at Brussels, was visited by Sir William Paget, who describes him as being in a most desponding condition, and repeatedly expressing his "dread of meeting death." Pomcroy says, "Whether it be accounted a Popish superstition or a falsehood, I have it from a right trusty man of the Gospel, that some horrible things occurred to bring shame on the inside life of the King's Commissioners, which the Abbess of Shaftesbury foretold. It appears strange, but it is true. It is certain that several of the Commissioners died in a very unsettled state of mind. It was also bruited about that Dr. London and Dean Layton left written confessions, with a request that those

confessions should be made public ; but it is probable that their friends, or the King's Council, would destroy such documents wherever they could obtain them<sup>3</sup>." It is not improbable that some of these repentant confessions may yet be discovered amongst the vast masses of MSS. unexamined in the public offices.

CHARLES BRANDON, DUKE OF SUFFOLK.

MACAULAY describes the eccentric Duke of Shrewsbury of 1688 as the "petted child of fortune." But the title might be more appropriately conferred on Charles Brandon, who, from being the son of a needy country gentleman, became, through royal favour, Duke of Suffolk, and the possessor of large estates. Miss Strickland mentions Suffolk as "always coming forward to help to crush any victim the King was sacrificing." And she adds, "He was one of Anna Boleyn's judges, and pronounced her guilty. He also witnessed her death, being on the scaffold with no friendly intention<sup>4</sup>."

Charles Brandon has hitherto been represented and accepted as one of the most "amiable and excellent personages connected with Henry's court." Comparatively speaking, he may have been, for good qualities were sadly rare about the person of the King. Recent researches have discovered the Duke of Suffolk to be, as Mr. Brewer sums him up, "mean, ignorant, avaricious, and deceitful." He had a fine-looking, portly person, and was of some repute as a soldier—as a contemporary described him, "the showman of tournaments;" but, as a man, it is saying enough in his con-

<sup>3</sup> John Pomeroy's "Letters to Bishop Barlow."

<sup>4</sup> Miss Strickland's "Queens of England," vol. ii. p. 675.

demnation, to set him down as worthy of Henry's friendship. He was the largest participator in the confiscation of the monastic lands. The Rev. Mr. Blunt represents him as a "friend to the Reformers," and then briefly describes his demerits, and the amount of property he obtained through Cromwell's inquisition. "The most astonishing of all the appropriations was made to the King's brother-in-law, and brother in profligacy, Charles Brandon, Duke of Suffolk. This man, whose life was one scene of shameless living, became the proprietor of no fewer than thirty monasteries, chiefly in Lincolnshire and Warwickshire." The same author's opinion of the "newly-installed landowners" is worthy of the consideration of those who have read so many tales of the "lazy, worthless monks." "If the new proprietors," Mr. Blunt observes, "had endeavoured to promote in any degree the religious objects for which they (the monasteries) had originally been intended, some excuse might have been offered for them, and their good deeds would have stood, perhaps, in the light of a condonation for what, if it was not sacrilege, was the very nearest approach possible to that crime. But no good deeds are to be told of these men. They briefly tried to build for themselves fine houses out of the property once dedicated to God's service: and if God's service was neglected any where, it was upon the estates thus acquired. The original grantees of the lands seldom indeed prospered, and their estates either passed into other families or to distant branches of their own. Cromwell's property was wasted by his son, and Suffolk's last heirs did not long survive himself<sup>5</sup>."

For years Wolsey was the personal friend of Suffolk.

<sup>5</sup> Blunt's "Reformation of the Church of England," vol. i. p. 379.

On the marriage of Henry's sister Mary with that nobleman, he was beset with difficulties, from which no one but the Cardinal could extricate him. "Wolsey received confidential letters from Suffolk; and even dictated letters for the Princess Mary to her brother, in which he assured the King how much attached his sister was to her lover; and did every thing to bring matters to a happy end<sup>6</sup>." Suffolk writes to the King complaining that the "whole Council, the Cardinal of York excepted, are determined to either put him in prison, or otherwise cause his death." The powerful influence of Wolsey reconciled Henry to the marriage, and Suffolk and his wife enjoyed the King's friendship for many years. Judging from the State Papers, there is reason to believe that the Cardinal of York saved Suffolk's life on two or three occasions. The latter, however, repaid the favour by taking a leading part in promoting the Cardinal's downfall. He was ungrateful and treacherous to Wolsey—in fact, he evinced the same evil qualities to all who ever served him, if he at all deemed that his own interests might be forwarded by their misfortunes. His letters, still extant, prove him to have been uneducated; but he was learned enough in profligacy to constitute him a pleasant companion of Henry in his private orgies with the Seymours and others. Perhaps the most noteworthy incident in Suffolk's public career was the acquisition of his vast property.

According to an ancient custom, which was enforced by Edward III., and to which the Pope agreed, it was "lawful for the descendants of families who founded religious houses, to claim the said property, if it were in future time applied to any other purpose apart from

<sup>6</sup> Brewer's "State Papers."

religion and charity?.” There were at this time very few of the descendants living. And it would have been a hazardous experiment to call the King’s attention to this ancient custom. Nevertheless there were persons possessed of sufficient courage to write to Cromwell, claiming some particular portion of the lands given to the Duke of Suffolk. Of course those appeals were made in vain.

The inalienableness of Church property was not recognized by any statute or order of the mediaeval Church. On their election the heads of monastic and capitular bodies took a solemn oath never to alienate, or be a party to the alienation, of any portion of the lands or goods of which they were made the trustees. The Council of Carthage (A.D. 398) prohibited the alienation of Church lands or goods; except with the full consent of the bishops of the places concerned. Subsequent councils made the obligation far more stringent. For many ages the most despotic and unprincipled Kings respected those ancient statutes.

In 1546 the Duke of Suffolk died, after having escaped the “storms of the Court,” from the days of Wolsey. He was sustained in those evil times neither by honesty nor ability. He remained the same profligate, the same dissembler, the same heartless courtier, the same scoffer at the religion of his fathers, up to the hour at which he was suddenly called to another world to render an account of a misspent life. The reader may fairly judge his reputation from the character of the men with whom he had been so long associated. Hume’s eulogies on public men are justly liable to a certain amount of suspicion. “Cranmer lost this year,”

<sup>7</sup> Rymer, iii. p. 132; Fuller’s “Church Hist.” vol. i.

says Hume, “the most sincere and powerful friend whom he possessed at Court—Charles Brandon, Duke of Suffolk<sup>8</sup>.” Suffolk learned much from Cranmer, who taught him the arts by which he himself became a master of dissimulation; for it was only by such a course, accompanied by ready effort to pander to the King’s passions, that Cranmer himself held office. Many of the wicked deeds of Henry may be traced to his Archbishop and his own brother-in-law. Learned and “observant of man and matters” as Henry undoubtedly was, he was ever deceived in his estimate of men—an accurate knowledge of whom would so much have benefited him here and hereafter. The long friendship he manifested for Suffolk and Cranmer is a proof of this. He expressed his sorrow for the loss of Suffolk, and declared that during the whole course of their “correspondence,” his brother-in-law had not made any attempt to injure an adversary, had never whispered a word to the disadvantage of any one. Then, addressing his council, he continued:—“Is there any amongst you, my lords, that can say as much<sup>9</sup>? ” According to Edward Hall, when the King finished these words, “he looked round in all the faces of his council, and saw that confusion which the consciousness of mighty guilt naturally placed upon the faces of men whom his Highness thought to be honest.” May not astonishment be a fairer word for Hall to use than “confusion?” Doubtless the Council marvelled at Henry’s estimate of Suffolk, and were “confounded” that so bad a man could be so eulogised. Henry was indeed much deceived as to the real character of his kinsman. The King said that Suffolk never complained

<sup>8</sup> Coke’s “Instit.” cap. 99; Hume, vol. iii. p. 272.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid.

of or accused a man ; but Suffolk had little need to ask his King to right *his* wrongs : he had a following ready and able to settle such affairs with any one who had the temerity to excite the hatred of Charles Brandon. And, again, old soldiers are not much given to “make complaints” of their enemies. They proceed in another way.

Another associate in Henry’s license was Lord Clinton, who desecrated the sacrament of marriage by espousing the cast-off mistress of the King, displaced to make room for Anna Boleyn. As dowry with this virtuous dame, Clinton received from her former lover the lands and other property of thirteen abbeys and convents. This Clinton is shown by general authority to have been a “dicer, a drunkard, and a debauchee.” He afterwards joined in “reforming” the religion of England, but has left no testimony that he ever reformed himself.

Another of the “companions of the King’s pleasure” was Sir Francis Bryan, the kinsman of Anna Boleyn. He is represented by his contemporaries as “the man who corrupted King Henry ;” but this accusation might more justly be laid to the account of Charles, Duke of Suffolk, and Lord Clinton—that is, if any man could corrupt a being with such passions as Henry. Bryan was one of the divorce agents at Rome, where he forged letters and falsified reports. He has been also charged with stealing from a cabinet a secret correspondence of Wolsey with Clement VII., and “placing Wolsey’s letters in his royal master’s possession.” Many circumstance raise doubts as to the accuracy of these statements, for the Pontiff was remarkable for the care and caution he used in securing his foreign correspon-

dence. Sir Francis Bryan, however, was capable of committing such an act of larcenous dishonour, if he only had the opportunity. In London he was known as a “dicer and a profligate.” He appeared to some advantage in the masks and theatrical entertainments of the King; was the associate of Suffolk and Clinton in their night revels and visits to Bankside. He had the talent to adapt himself to whatever the court required, whether masking, dicing, or “discreditable conversation.” The only virtue he seemed to possess, was courage—his greatest talent that of being a clever practical soldier. At the battle of Musselburgh (1547) he commanded with skill and valour; is described as being humane to the wounded enemy, and kind to his own soldiers. He was esteemed a good Latin and Spanish scholar, and the author of some songs and sonnets. His politics and religion were those of the court—“for the time being.”

#### THE CONVOCATION AND THE KING.

THE convocations of Henry’s reign appear in a painful light to posterity; they had ceased to possess that independence of character which formerly made their deliberations respected. But this change of action—not principle—may be accounted for from the continued threats of a despotic King, and venal ministers, whose church patronage was bestowed for political services. Then the presence of Lord Cromwell, his theologian Ales, in Convocation, to represent the King as head of the Church, had the worst results. Dr. Whyte describes “Cromwell’s presence there as a scandal that no honest or independent priests should tolerate.” But

when Maisters Foxe, Fisher, Wareham, Collett, and the men of that school had passed away, and were succeeded by such clerics as Roland Lee, Edward Lee, Thomas Cranmer, Edward Foxe, Shaxton, Latimer, Ridley, Hooper, Layton, London, Poynet, and others of the same accommodating description, it is not to be wondered that division and inconsistency marked the deliberations of this once high and dignified assembly. Lord Cromwell and Archbishop Cranmer carried out their policy by terror and corruption, yet there were men in Convocation who would not be purchased, and for whom the dungeon or the axe had no terrors. The modes adopted by the Archbishop for inducing priests to "adopt or promote" his political and religious schemes were of the most insidious and corrupt character; and his plans for "setting aside or hunting down" honest opponents amongst the clergy, exhibited a thorough disregard for justice and humanity. He ruined the archdiocese of Canterbury, for no virtuous clergyman could hold a cure under his administration.

The Supremacy question was the first great cause of rupture between the King and Convocation. "It was evident," writes Lingard, "that the adoption of the title of Head of the Church by the King, would experience considerable opposition from the clergy; but the cunning of Cromwell had already organized a plan which promised to secure their submission. . . . The Convocation offered a present of one hundred thousand pounds in return for a full pardon. To their grief and astonishment Henry refused the proposal, unless in the preamble to the grant a clause were introduced acknowledging the King to be the protector and only supreme head of the Church and clergy of England. Three

days were consumed in useless consultations; conferences were held with Cromwell and the royal commissioners; expedients were proposed and rejected; and a positive message was sent by the Viscount Rochfort, that the King would admit of no other alteration than the addition of the words 'under God.' What induced him to relent is unknown, but an amendment was moved with his permission (1531) by Archbishop Wareham, and carried with the unanimous consent of both Houses<sup>1</sup>. By this the grant was made in the usual manner; but in the enumeration of the motives on which it was founded, was inserted, within a parenthesis, the following clause, 'Of which Church and clergy will acknowledge his Majesty to be the chief protector, the only and supreme lord, and, as far as the law of Christ will allow, the Supreme Head<sup>2</sup>.' The Northern Convocation adopted the same language, and voted for the same purpose a grant of eighteen thousand eight hundred and forty pounds. It is plain that the introduction of the words, 'as far as the law of Christ will allow,' served to invalidate the whole recognition; since those who might reject the King's supremacy could maintain that it was not allowed by the law of Christ. But Henry was yet wavering and irresolute; he sought to intimidate the Court of Rome, but had not determined to separate from its communion<sup>3</sup>."

The hesitation of the Monarch is easily explained. Cranmer had not yet become the confidential adviser of the Crown.

In 1531, another declaration was, it is alleged, "ex-

<sup>1</sup> Wilkins, p. 725.

<sup>2</sup> Wilkins, p. 742.

<sup>3</sup> Lingard, vol. iv. pp. 55—89.

torted, through fear," from Convocation, to the effect "that the King was the Protector and Supreme Head of the Church and clergy of England." But, to "satisfy the conscience" of another class of clerics, a clause was added, which invalidated the above, stating that his Highness was "Supreme Head in so far as it was permitted by the law of Christ." Lord Cromwell and his royal master, however, thought little of the amendments or the declarations of Convocations, for every man who could not be purchased or silenced in some fashion, was soon disposed of by Cromwell. A majority of the Convocation in 1534 supported the Crown in its claims to the "headship of the Church." In this year Convocation decreed, that "the Act lately passed against appeals to Rome, together with the King's appeal from the Pope to a General Council, should be affixed to the doors of all the Churches in the Kingdom." And again they voted with "due deliberation," that the "Bishop of Rome had by the law of God no more jurisdiction in England than any other foreign bishop; and that the authority which he and his predecessors had exercised there was only by usurpation and the sufferance of English princes." This resolution, passed by the Lower House of Convocation, was opposed by only five members. The same question was submitted in the Upper House of Convocation, where the leaders of the Church were supposed to be uninfluenced by the Court; but the question was carried almost unanimously. The Bishops proceeded so far to please the Crown, that they took out new Commissions by which all their spiritual and episcopal authority was expressly affirmed to be derived from the King, and to be entirely dependent on "*his* good will

and pleasure<sup>4</sup>.” In 1536 the Lower House of Convocation were as ductile to the King’s behests as they had been at any previous period. They declared that they intended not to do or speak any thing which might be unpleasant to the King’s Highness, whom they acknowledged as their Supreme Head, and whose commands they were resolved to obey—renouncing the Pope’s “usurped authority, with all his inventions, now extinguished and demolished; and addicting themselves to Almighty God and His laws, and unto the King, and the laws made within his Kingdom<sup>5</sup>.” This resolution did not receive the sanction of the Upper House of Convocation; and Henry, though flattered by the praises he received, was not pleased, because he knew well at the time that the homage offered to him was mere dissimulation. Lingard describes the Convocation of this period to be, like the Peers and Commons, “the too obsequious servants of their Sovereign.” This opinion is fully corroborated by other authorities. Mr. Froude acknowledges that the members of Convocation did not believe for a moment in the King’s supremacy, but acted from fear or venality. In fact, a reign of terror had been inaugurated, in which any act of honest independence, where the King was concerned, destroyed the man who displayed it with the certainty of fate.

The object of the contending parties in the State was to win the King’s favour, that they might crush their own antagonists. Whether of the Papal or Anti-Papal party, few were actuated by a desire to promote Christian feeling. Those who supported the King’s spiritual supremacy were not sincere in their advocacy of his

<sup>4</sup> Collier’s “Eccl. Hist.” vol. ii.

<sup>5</sup> Collier, vol. ii. p. 119.

claims to that office ; and when their opponents had the honesty and boldness to inquire in what part of the Scripture the government of the Church was permitted to be assumed by a layman, the King's clerical and temporal counsellors appealed to those texts which prescribe obedience to the sovereign and government of a country. The “monarch,” they maintained, “was the image of the Almighty Creator upon this earth ; to disobey his Highness's (Henry's) commands, was to disobey God Himself ; to limit His authority, when no limit was laid down, was an offence against the King ; and to make distinctions when the Holy Scripture made none, was an impiety against God.” The advocates of these propositions admitted that the “additional powers now claimed might be unjustly used by a bad King ; but to resist was a crime ; and it became the duty of those who suffered, to submit patiently and like good Christians to the will and pleasure of their sovereign lord the King<sup>6</sup>.” These views were set forth in the pulpit on Sundays and holidays by the secular clergy. The monastic orders, however, pursued a very different course, and consequently incurred the hatred of the King, whose vanity was raised to the highest pitch by the illegitimate and dangerous powers conferred upon him by Parliament, and ratified by the prelacy and seculars. But the reader must not imagine that this accommodating Convocation was in any way favourable to the Lutheran doctrines : quite the contrary. It has been alleged that every ecclesiastic or layman who wished to remove abuses—such as pluralities, non-residence, a stricter discipline of the secular clergy, and “well-defined

<sup>6</sup> Collier's “Ecclesiastical Hist.,” vol. v. ; Heylin, Echard, Leland, Lingard, and Froude.

understanding as to what were the spiritual and political claims urged by the Pontiff, as the Head of the Church,"—were secret upholders of the "new learning." Collier states that the clergy did not make so absolute a submission as has been generally ascribed to them. Herbert, Holinshed, Foxe, Fuller, and Burnett, give different versions of what occurred; but between misrepresentation, "terror, and silence," on the part of a large number of the clergy, it is now difficult to judge of their real sentiments. A close sifting, however, of the supremacy question will prove that they were, as a body, still the spiritual subjects of the Pontiff, and not of the King of England. Every thing has been misrepresented, or coloured, in order to give a seemingly healthy and honest tone to the future proceedings of those who styled themselves "Reformers."

HENRY THE EIGHTH'S SPIRITUAL KINGDOM.—WARNING  
TO THE "SCRIPTURE EXPOUNDERS."

MANY countries have changed their government—few their religion; but how many disturbances and how much bloodshed has not the latter change involved! It filled Germany with civil strife, and raised myriads of revolutionary sectaries, who agreed in nothing but disagreement. And it surely has not been without its disturbing elements in England. It produced the Puritans, and they begat revolution. . . . Some writers have noticed the fact that the Roi Galanthomme, Francis I., whose assistant spouses were not so ambitious or so moral as Anna Boleyn in the matter of marriage, complained once to the Nuncio then in Paris, and menaced an imitation of Henry's secession. "No, sire," said the astute Nuncio, "you would be the first

to repent it ; the spreading of a new religion amongst the common people is soon attended with a revolution in government.” Again, Admiral de Coligny happening to converse with the celebrated Strozzi about the new doctrine, the latter assured the Admiral that “if the King wants to destroy the monarchy he cannot take a better way than to change the religion of the country.” In one of his sermons the well-known Huguenot preacher, M. d’Aillé, remarked that “never was there a new religion promulgated but a great many prophets started up who followed one another in propagating their reveries.” “To change the religion of a country,” says David Hume, “even when seconded by a party, is one of the most perilous enterprises which any sovereign can attempt, and often proves the most destructive to royal authority.” This state of facts Henry himself realized. When the storm of passion had passed away he calmly and apprehensively weighed the responsibility he had undertaken. In becoming the head of a church he had not reckoned the cost, and his will was, for too long a time, the order of observance. Being discontented he revolted, and his vanity, not his belief, founded a new spiritual kingdom. He forgot the principles of government if he ever intended to establish ordinances for the new condition of affairs, and so those outside of his immediate influence adopted their own ordinances—one God the worshipped of a myriad formulæ. This state of things, Henry, in the presence of death, disliked and feared.

On the Christmas Eve of 1545, the King made his last speech to Parliament—a report of which is perhaps the most remarkable document extant of his reign. The Lord Chancellor was about as usual to address the

peers in the King's name, when Henry arose, and in a grave but very kindly mood intimated his desire to speak some words. He was feeble in body, but his voice thrilled through every heart in the hushed assembly.

"I am very sorry," said the King, "to know and to hear how unreverendly that precious jewel, the word of God, is disputed, rhymed, sung, and jingled in every ale-house and tavern<sup>7</sup>. This kind of man is depraved, and that kind of man; this ceremony and that ceremony. Of this I am sure, that charity was never so faint among you; and God Himself amongst Christians was never less reverenced, honoured, and served. Therefore, as I said before, be in charity one with another, like brother and brother. Have respect to the pleasing of God, and then I doubt not that the love I spoke of shall never be dissolved betwixt us."

Hall gives a long account of the above speech. Another version of it is to be found in a letter of Sir John Mason to Paget (State Papers). Both agree in the main facts. Hall is supposed to have been present, for he describes with great particularity the King's appearance, voice, gestures, &c.; and there seems no doubt that the King's words have been accurately transmitted. In another edition of this speech attributed to Hall, the King "partly blames the priests for the bitter religious feeling pervading society, some of whom (he said) were so stiff in their old *mumpsimus*, and others so busy with their new *sumpsimus*, that instead of preaching the Word of God, they were employed

<sup>7</sup> In Jeremy Taylor's "Liberty of Prophesying," sec. 4, the reader will find an interesting passage from that learned Protestant writer, on the "difficulty" of expounding the Scriptures.

in railing at each other ; and partly by the fact of the laity, whose delight it was to censure the proceedings of their bishops, priests, and preachers.”

After thanking the Parliament for their devotion to his person, and the liberality with which they granted the “subsidies,” he adverted to the “interest he took in the poor ; that it was his intention to serve God faithfully, and to provide for the wants of the poor.” And then, with an air of solemnity he paused for a moment, and a “flood of tears rolled down his face.” The “assembly became astonished—some cried and others murmured.” The King resumed. He called on them “in the name of God, and for the honour of God Almighty to assist him.” “I hear,” said he, “that the special foundation of our religion being charity between man and man, it is so refrigerate as there was never more dissension and lack of love between man and man, the occasions whereof are opinions only, and names devised for the continuance of the same. Some are called Papists, some Lutherans, and some Anabaptists—names devised of the devil, and yet not fully without ground, for the severing of one man’s heart, by conceit of opinion from the other. For the remedy whereof I desire—first, every man of himself to travail for his own amendment. Secondly, I exhort the bishops and clergy, who are noted to be the salt and lamps of the world, by amending of their divisions to give example to the rest and to agree especially in their teaching—which, seeing there is but one truth and verity, they may easily do, calling therein for the aid of God. Finally, I exhort the nobles and the laity not to receive the grace of God in vain ; and albeit, by the instinct of the Lord God, the Scriptures have been permitted unto

them in the English tongue ; yet *not to take upon them the judgment and exposition of the same*, but reverendly and humbly, with fear and dread, to receive and use the knowledge which it hath pleased God to show unto them, and in any doubt to resort unto the learned, or at best the higher powers."

This depreciation of division, on the part of Henry, is a patent indication of remorse for the sad changes he had wrought. Might not those dissidents, weary of the bitter strife, ask with justice the moribund and now apprehensive Monarch, "Was it not thou, O King, who first rent the veil of the temple?" In Mr. Froude's panegyric of Henry, he remarks as to the Monarch's death, "*He ended by accepting and approving what he had commenced with persecuting.*" Henry never denied any of the doctrines of the Catholic Church. He quarrelled with that Church because it would not grant him a divorce, but he never discarded or denounced its dogmata. For his profuse expenses and necessities he plundered the religious houses, without denying the religion. He burned Reformers as heretics ; and, if he hanged Papists for denying his supremacy, he acted on his arrogant privilege merely, and not from any change in his faith. It is curious that many years before he quarrelled with the Pope he submitted the manuscript of his celebrated book against Luther to Sir Thomas More, who then considered that his royal Master "*conceded too many privileges and rights to the Papacy ;*" to which the King replied in these remarkable words :—"*Whatsoever impediment be to the contrary, we will set forth, for our parts, his authority to the utmost as it deserves ; for from that See we first received our faith, and after our imperial crown and*

sceptre." More, who was an astute constitutional lawyer, as well as a man of truth and virtue, knowing the independence of the Roman See, which had been asserted by a long line of English Sovereigns, afterwards, when under sentence of death, remarked, in recalling this conversation, that he had never heard before that interview that Henry had received from the Vatican either his faith or his sceptre. At the period of which More spoke, Henry entertained no notion of getting rid of his "Spanish bride," his ~~lawful~~ wife. But when his fitful nature adopted another love, his disappointment at the Pope's refusal to grant a divorce fired his absolute will to make his subjects participators in his revenge. And, again, in his new character of universal referee in religious matters he experienced an uncertain satisfaction. He did not feel quite confident in the fitness of his installation; and, amongst many other instances of his want of realization of the vicarious religious powers bestowed by his ready ministers, we have the case of a fanatic preacher, named Barnes. The reader may remember the case of this preacher, who, in fear of the King, said he submitted his judgment to his Highness; upon which the Monarch became angry, and observed, "Yield not to me; I am but a mortal man." And then turning to a small altar in the apartment, in which the Holy Sacrament was placed, continued, "*Yonder is the Master of us all; yield in truth to Him; otherwise submit yourself not to me.*" So much for the King's practice of those Divine maxims which he quoted under the influence of Papal principles—principles which his heart had never abandoned; nevertheless to the last, he was so fraught with human pride in its worst sense, and so much a

slave to his remorseless temperament, that he would sacrifice all to accomplish his vengeance. He made no sign of reconciliation with the head of that Church, to whose sacramental rites he had recourse during his last illness. In his remarkable will, which involves singular contradictions, he styles himself “and on earth, *immediately under God*, Supreme Head of the Church of England and of Ireland.” This was setting down in words the inspiration of his facile flatterer, Cranmer. In another passage he orders masses to be offered daily for his “soul’s health while the world will endure.” And again, he proclaims his devotion to “the Mother of God,” and “craves her intercession on his behalf.” Here we witness a conflict between pride and conscience—a haughty assumption and a remorseful acknowledgment—both elements mutually destructive, and ineffectual for honest contrition. If he believed in the efficacy of masses, and felt devotion for the Blessed Virgin, he must have known that his assumption of the Supreme “Headship of the Church” was regarded by the Catholic Church as an arrogation both blasphemous and rebellious<sup>8</sup>.

Of the last days of Henry the Eighth there is little known. The day before his death he held a long conversation with Lord Hertford, Paget, and Denny. There is no record of what took place; but it was

<sup>8</sup> There are at present in the “King’s Library” at the British Museum, a magnificently illuminated missal and a psalter of Henry VIII. Horace Walpole, in his “Royal Authors,” states that the King erased from the calendar of these books the name of every Saint who became a Pope. But there are no marks of erasure on the books in question. Perhaps Walpole confounded them with the Psalters and Bibles in the library of Salisbury Cathedral, from which Lord Cromwell ordered the name of the Pope to be blotted out.

stated by those closely connected with the King that his Highness expressed earnest anxiety about the condition of religion in the country ; that “ he wished the new heresy to be put down, and the old faith re-established and maintained throughout the land ; that he closely questioned the members of the Council as to their attachment to Catholicity ; that they all swore on bended knees that they would never desert the principles of their fathers.” These assurances, together with the fact that Hertford and Paget attended mass that morning in the dying Monarch’s room, were to be assumed as proofs of their sincerity and piety, and gave him some comfort in those terrible intervals of remorse with which he was visited that last day of his existence. Cranmer was on that day absent. Was his absence caused by scruples as to making fresh oaths and new protestations as to the maintenance of the olden faith of England ? Or did he shrink from the scene in which Lord Hertford performed so characteristically his part in deception and falsehood ? Never was human being so deceived as Henry at this closing point of his existence. Let the reader again ponder on the words of Dean Hook<sup>9</sup>, and then contemplate the conduct of Lord Hertford—the great lay apostle of the Reformation—on his knees at the couch of his dying brother-in-law—swearing eternal fealty to the principles of the Catholic Church !

The day had now passed—and the long night of agony commenced. It was one of fearful bodily suffering to the King, broken by intervals of remorse and prayer. Had human pride vanished ? Had

<sup>9</sup> Dean Hook states that all the religious changes which took place in Edward’s reign were agreed on during the lifetime of Henry.

mercy returned to his breast? Was the King at peace with all the world? No; a terrible scene remained to be enacted. At ten of the clock, when the cold sweat of death covered his face, the King was making a faint effort to sign a death warrant—the warrant which was to consign the Duke of Norfolk to the headsman. This action manifested the mastery of a ruthless spirit, and evinced the dominion of final impenitence. In the very arms of death he would injure the living—on the threshold of the grave he would turn from the presence of his God to make one more sacrifice to the enemy of mankind. Yet even that thirst for the blood of an illustrious subject, whose age he had left nearly childless, might not have been the worst, if it had not been the last, of the crimes of this terrible monarch. A death-bed has been described as the altar of forgiveness, where charity commingles with the spirit of prayer. These attributes were absent from the dying couch of Henry Tudor, whose last despairing words, chronicled by Anthony Denny, “All is lost,” seem an awful appreciation of the retribution about to visit a wicked and truculent career<sup>1</sup>.

Three days the King’s death was concealed from the public, to enable Cranmer and Lord Hertford to make their arrangements. It was agreed that all the religious ceremonies should be conducted according to the observance of the Catholic Church. Church-bells tolled, and masses were celebrated daily throughout London.

The chest or funeral bier, wherein the royal corpse was laid, stood in the midst of the privy chamber, with

<sup>1</sup> Burnet, Leti, Thevet, Harpsfield, Rapin, Godwin, Mackintosh, Tytler, and Lingard.

“lights, and divine service was said about him, with masses, obsequies, and continual watch made by the chaplains and gentlemen of the privy chamber, in their course and order, night and day, for five days, till the chapel was ready, where was a goodly hearse, with eighty square tapers, every light containing two feet in length, in the whole 1800 or 2000 weight in wax, garnished with pensils, escutcheons, banners, and bannerets of descents; and at the four corners, banners of saints, beaten in fine gold upon damask, with a majesty (i. e. canopy) over of rich cloth of tissue, and valance of black silk, and fringe of black silk and gold. The barriers without the hearse, and the sides and floor of the chapel were covered with black cloth to the high altar, and the sides and ceiling set with the banners and standards of St. George and others<sup>2</sup>. ”

On the 2nd of February, the corpse was removed and brought into the chapel, by the lord great master and officers of the household, and then placed within the hearse, under a pall of rich cloth of tissue, garnished with scutcheons, and a rich cloth of gold set with precious stones. The body continued there twelve days, “with masses and *diriges* sung and said every day”—Norroy each day standing at the choir door, and beginning with these words in a loud voice, “Of your charity pray for the soul of the high and mighty prince, our late sovereign lord and King, Henry VIII.”

The royal remains being carried to Windsor to be buried, stood all night among the broken walls of the Convent of Sion, and there “the leaden coffin being cleft by the shaking of the carriage, the pavement of the church was wetted with Henry’s blood. In the

<sup>2</sup> MS. in the College of Arms.

morning came plumbers to solder the coffin, under whose feet—I tremble while I write it—(says the author) was suddenly seen *a dog creeping, and licking up the King's blood.* If you ask me how I know this, I answer, William Greville, who could scarcely drive away the dog, told me, and so did the plumber also<sup>3</sup>."

This dismantled convent had been the prison of Catherine Howard, whose execution took place five years the day before the corpse of her ruthless destroyer reached its temporary resting-place. The reader will remember the denunciation by Father Peto, at Greenwich Church, in 1533, in presence of Henry and Anna Boleyn, when the fearless monk compared the monarch to Ahab, and told him to his face, that "the dogs would, in like manner, lick his blood." Miss Strickland would condemn any assumption of this shocking incident as the fulfilment of a vaticination. But be it coincidence or the verification of prophecy, the fact stands, and needs no disquisition. Doubtless the worst matter about these *parentalia* of a cruel despot was the conduct of Bishop Gardiner, who preached the funeral sermon at Windsor on the 16th of February, taking for his text, "Blessed are they who die in the Lord!" in which he ascribed to Henry all the virtues he possessed not, and described the loss "which both high and low had sustained in the death of so good and gracious a king." To show that the monarch, who has been accepted by so many unread people of England as the first Protestant King of this realm was even buried according to the rites and observances of the Catholic Church, we copy the ceremony from the before-mentioned MS. in the College of

<sup>3</sup>. MS. in the Sloane Collection.

Arms:—"The corpse being let down by a vice, with the help of sixteen tall yeomen of the guard, Bishop Gardiner, standing at the head of the vault, proceeded with the Burial Service, and about the same (the bishop) stood all the head officers of the household—as the lord great master, the lord chamberlain, the lord treasurer, comptroller, serjeant porter, and the four gentlemen ushers in ordinary, with their staves and rods in their hands, and when the mould was brought and cast into the grave, by the officiating prelate, at the words—*Pulvis pulveri, cinis cineri*, then first the great lord master, and, after him, the lord chamberlain and all the rest, brake their staves in shivers, upon their heads, and cast them after the corpse into the pit, with exceeding sorrow and heaviness, not without grievous sighs and tears. After this, *De Profundis* was said, the grave covered over with planks, and Garter, attended by his officers, stood in the midst of the choir, and proclaimed the young King's titles, and the rest of his officers repeated the same after him thrice. Then the trumpets sounded, with great melody and courage, to the comfort of all them that were present." It may be mentioned that on some of the banners carried at Henry's funeral were quartered the arms of Jane Seymour and of Catherine Parr, the only two wives he acknowledged, as Miss Strickland says, out of six. In 1813 the coffin of Henry was opened by Sir Henry Halford, in the presence of the Prince Regent, when the body was found quite perfect, and a red beard had grown after death quite down to the corpse's feet.

## SOMERSET, THE GREAT LAY REFORMER.

FOXE and several of his contemporaries have drawn glowing pictures of the extraordinary deserts of the Protector Somerset, and the miraculous proceedings connected with him<sup>4</sup>. But Foxe wrote amidst the smoke of infatuated bigotry, which utterly blinded him to the truth. The few who still have any trust in Burnet, and who can have faith in him only because they do not know his character, may wish to see his portrait of the Protector. “Edward Seymour, Duke of Somerset, was a person of great virtues, eminent for piety, humble and affable in his greatness, sincere and candid in all his actions. He was a better captain than a counsellor—had been often successful in his undertakings, was always careful of the poor and the oppressed ; and, in a word, had as many virtues and as few faults as most great men have ever had. The Papists loaded his fame while living, and his memory when dead, with the blackest and foulest calumnies.” To descend from romance to fact. Somerset commenced his Protectorate on Edward’s accession, by an act of perjury ; for his very first proceeding was to violate the oath he had taken to the dying Henry that he would carry out his last will and testament, almost every provision of which he set aside. Somerset, no doubt, courted popularity with the London mob by telling them he intended creating great institutions for the benefit of the people out of the property of the “lazy and profligate Churchmen whom the Lord in His mercy had caused to be dispersed.” What he accomplished for the lower classes

<sup>4</sup> Stowe, p. 607 ; also Ellis, 2nd Series, ii. 215.

history has long since revealed; by the higher classes he was utterly and unanimously hated, and they omitted no device to compass his overthrow. Perhaps the division of honesty between the Protector and his enemies was evenly balanced. That Henry the Eighth, in the blackest day of his tyranny, regarded his brother-in-law as a man after his own heart, is proved by the fact of his entrusting him (then Lord Hertford) with one of the most sanguinary commissions ever given by a tyrant and executed by a subject. Three years before Henry was summoned to his dread account, on the 10th of April, 1544, he sent the following instructions to Hertford, then commanding the army invading Scotland:—"To put all to fire and sword, to burn Edinburgh Town, and to raze and deface it, when you have sacked it, and gotten what you can out of it. Do what you can out of hand, and without long tarrying, to beat down and overthrow the castle, sack Holyrood House, and as many towns and villages about Edinburgh as you conveniently can. Sack Leith, and burn and subvert it and all the rest, *putting man, woman, and child to fire and sword, without exception when any resistance shall be made against you*; and this done, pass over to Fife land and extend like extremities and destructions in all towns and villages whereunto ye may reach conveniently; not forgetting, amongst the rest, so to spoil and turn upside down the Cardinal's town of St. Andrews as the upper stone may be the nether, and not one stick stand upon another, *sparing no creature alive within the same, specially such as, either in friendship or in blood be allied to the Cardinal.*" This edict is certainly one of the most sanguinary and atrocious passages in all history. Nor did Hertford fail to carry out the

cruel programme, for he himself writes, in September, 1544, that “he had burnt seven monasteries and religious houses, sixteen castles and towns, five market towns, two hundred and forty-three villages, thirteen mills, and *three hospitals*<sup>5</sup>. ” If the vengeance of William of Normandy (1069-70) was satisfied with slaying 100,000 of his newly-acquired English subjects, King Henry’s deputy in Scotland only fell short of a similar satisfaction owing to the paucity of the population and the impoverishment of the country desolated by his troops. But the “good lord of Hertford” sped him so well in the career of extermination, that he felt empowered to give thanks to the “God of battles,” and, what he thought more of, received the congratulation and approval of his earthly king. Surely this course of bloodshed, rapine, and cruelty was a strange preparation in a man about to assume the task of reforming the creed of a nation: yet Somerset was one of the most active if not the most sincere of the early Reformers. He certainly had a vast worldly interest in upsetting the olden faith; but, whatever his motives, there is no doubt of his potent influence in establishing Protestantism. As to the statement that he was a friend to the people, the answer is to be found in his laws for the enslavement of that people, and the pitiless mode in which those black statutes were enforced.

When the King was buried, one of the first public acts of Lord Hertford was to summon a Parliament in the interest of those by whom he was supported. This was accomplished by force and corruption. He sent commissioners throughout the country to set aside

<sup>5</sup> State Papers of Henry VIIIth’s reign, in connexion with Scotland.

Catholic worship, and introduce the formularies prepared in Henry's reign by Cranmer and Poynet. The bishops received orders to abolish in their respective dioceses the custom of "bearing candles on Candlemas Day, of receiving ashes on Ash Wednesday, and of carrying palms on Palm Sunday<sup>6</sup>. These were ancient customs, to which the people were long attached, and their removal in parts of the country led to riot and disorder. The mass was not at first superseded—the innovators cautiously feeling their way. The gross language used by Bale and Poynet, in relation to celibacy on the part of religious orders, gave offence to the people of Devonshire, Somersetshire, and other parts of the kingdom, in which the ancient faith was illustrated by numerous venerable memorials. The conduct of those apostate priests when they made "missions into the country" was a special source of scandal and ill-feeling. As to John Bale, he cared not what he said or did. Coverdale was also a stipendiary of the Council, and traversed the country, bestowing praises on the Protector and the young King. When the new liturgy was first "practised by command of the Council," Coverdale expressed his admiration of the "Holy Work." He eulogized the homilies and the paraphrase, which, he said, "emanated from men who were filled with the Lord." King Edward was "the high and chief admiral of the great army of the Lord of Hosts; principal captain and governor of us all under Him; the most noble ruler of his ship, even our most comfortable Noah, whom the eternal God hath chosen to be the bringer of us unto rest and quietness<sup>7</sup>." Seeing that the King had not reached his tenth year when this nautical panegyric

<sup>6</sup> Wilkins, ii. p. 23.

<sup>7</sup> Apud Strype, ii. p. 65.

was pronounced, the reader will be apt to set down the wisdom of the Monarch and the honesty of the flatterer as equally genuine. But the Reforming prelates were all noted for the exaggerated falsehood of their fulsome adulation—one notorious instance of which the reader has seen in Latimer's letter about Edward's birth.

The “setting aside” of religion, and deposing the Catholic bishops, were the first acts of the King's council before the new Parliament met. The constitutional judges and lawyers of those times—venal and dishonest as most of them were—held the opinion of Lord Southampton, that this proceeding was illegal. Southampton was dismissed from the Chancellorship because he stated boldly to the Council that he would not violate himself, nor be a party to any member of the Council breaking the oath they had sworn to carry out—the late King's will. Lord Hertford, in order to overbear all opposition to his design to set aside the late King's will, created himself, as a first step, Duke of Somerset, and then procured a patent from the “boy-King,” by which he entirely overthrew, wrote Hume, “the last testament of Henry VIII., and produced a total revolution in the government, which looked like a subversion of all the laws of the realm<sup>8</sup>.” The bishops and a large number of the secular clergy were soon awakened to a sense of their danger. They publicly condemned the government schemes for “reforming” religion; their impeachment, arrest, and imprisonment followed. Tonstal, Bishop of Durham, was dismissed from the council-board. “Tonstal bore a high reputation, and was a man of the most unexceptionable charac-

<sup>8</sup> Hume, vol. iii. (fol. edit.) p. 293; Burnett, vol. ii.; Records, vol. vi.; Rymer.

ter in the realm<sup>9</sup>.” His conduct, however, in Henry’s reign was similar to that of Gardiner and other “Court prelates.” He and they were now beginning to reap the reward of men who subordinate their sacred duties to the demands of the world. Bonner was replaced in the See of London by Nicholas Ridley, to the great astonishment and indignation of the people of London. On this occasion Bonner acted with firmness, making a remarkable declaration of his principles, and stating his readiness to perish in their maintenance.

Gardiner, being the most distinguished, as well as the ablest of the prelacy, was the first selected for impeachment and persecution ; indeed, he did not wait for the action of the Council, but proclaimed their proceedings as contrary to statute law, usage, and equity. The old accusation of ignorance and incapacity has been made by the Anti-Papal party against the bishops of this period. Burnet, writing of them, says that they were “ignorant and weak men who understood religion little, and valued it less.” David Hume regards them as “prelates of blameless morals, and conscientiously attached to their religious principles.” The sacrifices those prelates made at the accession of Elizabeth, confirm the evidence of the philosophic historian. If Hume, left to himself, had lived a little later, where would have been Burnet as an authority ? If Gardiner’s policy during the divorce controversy helped to promote the ultimate change of religion in England, he subsequently laboured with zeal and ability to sustain the Catholic faith, and the numerous institutions which that Church had fostered in the land.

Though excluded from the Council, Dr. Gardiner set

<sup>9</sup> Hume, vol. iii. p. 297.

himself openly and fearlessly to oppose the measures brought forward under Somerset, to change the established religion—and there can be no doubt that he had the law on his side. Before a Parliament was called, the Council, disregarding the Act of the Six Articles, which was still in force, issued an order for changing the ceremonial of Divine Worship, published a book of homilies to be read by all priests, inculcating the new doctrines—and appointed ministers to go into every diocese to see that the new regulations were observed. Gardiner expressed his firm resolve that if the visitors came into his diocese he should proceed against them, that they might be restrained and punished. He also made representations on the subject to the Protector, and impressed upon him the illegality of those proceedings.

“ ‘Tis a dangerous thing,” said Dr. Gardiner, “to use too much freedom in researches of this kind. If you cut the old canal, the water is apt to run farther than you have a mind to. If you indulge the humour of novelty, you cannot put a stop to people’s demands, nor govern their indiscretions at pleasure.” “For my part,” continued he, on another occasion, “my sole concern is to manage the third and last act of my life with decency, and to make a handsome exit off the stage. Provided this point is secured, I am not solicitous about the rest. I am already by nature condemned to death. No man can give me a pardon from this sentence; nor so much as procure me a reprieve. To speak my mind, and to act as my conscience directs, are two branches of liberty which I can never part with. Sincerity in speech, and integrity in action, are entertaining qualities. They will stick by a man, when

every thing else takes its leave, and I must not resign them upon any consideration. The best of it is, if I do not throw them away myself, no man can force them from me. But if I give them up, then I am ruined by myself, and deserve to lose all my preferments! ”

Gardiner was in consequence summoned before the Council, and required to promise obedience to the royal injunctions. He appealed to the approaching Parliament. The Protector’s party became afraid of the resistance which, as a member of the House of Peers, Gardiner might offer to their measures, and they were still more alarmed at the “flames he was beginning to kindle out of doors,” by addressing himself to the religious feelings of the people. Therefore, though he could not be charged with an offence against the law, he was in the most arbitrary manner forthwith committed to the Fleet, and detained a close prisoner till the end of the Session. Attempts were in vain made, during his confinement, to gain him over to the Reformers. On one occasion, Cranmer, finding he could make no impression upon him, exclaimed in a sneering manner, “Brother of Winchester, you like not any thing new unless you be yourself the author thereof.” “Your Grace wrongeth me,” replied the old conservative prelate, “I have never been author yet of any one new thing, for which I thank my God.” An official was subsequently sent to him, to say that, if he would soften his opposition, he might have a place in the Council, and be restored to his See. But he answered indignantly, “that his character and conscience forbade it, and that if he agreed on such terms, he should deserve to be whipped in every market-town in the

<sup>1</sup> Collier, vol. ii. p. 228; Hume, vol. iii. p. 296.

realm, and then to be hanged for an example, as the veriest varlet that ever was bishop in any realm of Christendom<sup>2</sup>." At the end of the session Gardiner was set at liberty, and ordered by the Council to preach at Paul's Cross before the King, on the feast of St. Peter, with an injunction that he should not treat on any controverted question. He informed his friends that this was perhaps the only opportunity the young Prince might have of hearing the truth, and that he was determined whatever might be the consequence, to explain to him the true Catholic doctrine with respect to the mass and the Holy Eucharist. He kept his word; the sermon was a masterpiece of argument and eloquence. Dr. Whyte, who was present, considers that it was "one of the ablest explanations perhaps ever offered at Paul's Cross of the doctrines of the Roman Church. Every dogma was minutely explained to the King; and the conclusion of the discourse struck a warning at the hearts of many present, for he almost predicted the fate which befell my Lord of Hertford, and my Lord of Canterbury." The prelate who had the courage to preach such a sermon was not an adversary whom the Council could tolerate. On the following day Gardiner was committed to the Tower. During Dr. Gardiner's absence from Parliament, the Statute of the Six Articles was repealed, and bills passed allowing the clergy to marry; for the administration of the "Sacrament of the Lord's Supper" to the laity in both kinds; for uniformity of worship; and for the use of the new Liturgy<sup>3</sup>. Many of the bishops, animated by

<sup>2</sup> See Correspondence at full length; 1 St. Fr. 555; Campbell's "Chancellors," vol. ii. p. 51; Lingard, vol. v.; Turner, vol. xi.

<sup>3</sup> Statutes of Edward VI.

Gardiner's example, refused to conform, and Somerset hesitated to proceed against them—but he accomplished his designs in due time. When Gardiner had been confined for nearly three years (1550) a resolution was taken to deprive him and his brethren of their bishoprics, so that the “Reformed Church,” as then styled, might be complete. The method of proceeding against Dr. Gardiner was “gross, violent, and hardly disguised by any colour of law or justice<sup>4</sup>.” A deputation of the Council was sent to tempt him with questions. Finding him, as they said, “more pliant than they expected,” they rose in their demands, and at last insisted on “unconditional submission, and an acknowledgment of past errors.” Perceiving that it was their purpose either to dishonour or to ruin him, perhaps both, Gardiner determined not to gratify them by any further compliance. He therefore refused to answer any questions till he should recover his liberty, and concluded by asserting his innocence and demanding a fair trial. In a few days later he was brought before the Council, and when “certain articles” were read, and, in the King's name, he was required to answer them, he replied that “in all things his Majesty could lawfully command, he was most ready to obey; but for as much as there were divers things required of him that his conscience and honour as a prelate would not bear, therefore he prayed them to have him excused<sup>5</sup>.” Somerset immediately sequestered his ecclesiastical revenues, and threatened further arbitrary proceedings.

<sup>4</sup> Lord Campbell's “Chancellors,” vol. ii.

<sup>5</sup> Dr. Gardiner was required to approve of the suppression of monasteries, and the secularization of ecclesiastical property; the homilies of Cranmer; the paraphrase of Erasmus; and of every religious innovation established by the King's Council.

On the following day the sequestration of Dr. Gardiner's ecclesiastical revenues was carried out by the government, and an intimation was given to him, that if he did not submit within a few weeks, he should be finally deprived of his bishopric<sup>6</sup>. At the expiration of the notice given, Gardiner seemed even more devoted to his principles than before. A commission was then cited to the Metropolitan, three bishops, and six laymen, to bring him judicially to trial. The proceeding involved an entire subversion of statute law; Gardiner entered an able protest against the commission. He argued against the validity of their actions, which he contended were not founded on any statute law or precedent of England. The trial lasted three weeks, but before Gardiner could put "in evidence" in reply to the "several charges," Archbishop Cranmer rose and pronounced judgment in the case, declaring the "Lord Bishop of Winchester contumacious, and that he should be deprived of his bishopric forthwith." Gardiner appealed to the King; but his petition was rejected. He was again committed to prison, and on this occasion he was sent to the "dampest and meanest cell" in the Tower; with instructions from the Council that none should see him but one of the warders; that all his books and papers should be taken from him; and that he should be refused the use of pen, ink, and paper<sup>7</sup>. In this deserted and pitiable condition he continued for the remainder of Edward's reign. Here he had ample time to contemplate the result of the fatal facility with which he had lent himself to the unjust divorce of Queen Katherine, thus paving the way to all

<sup>6</sup> Lingard, vol. v. p. 310.

<sup>7</sup> Strype's "Cranmer," vol. i.; Hume, vol. iii.; Lingard, vol. v.

the confiscations, innovations, devastation, crime, and sorrow, which accompanied and followed Henry's quarrel with Rome.

"The most questionable of the measures pursued in the reign of Edward VI.," writes Sharon Turner<sup>s</sup>, "in promoting the Reformation, were the suspensions and imprisonments of those bishops who chose to adhere to their ancient system. In these deprivations, and in the confinement of Bonner, who held the See of London, and Gardiner of Winchester, we see, however, an arbitrary and ill-humoured action. Heath and Day, Bishops of Worcester and Chichester, were deprived of their sees and imprisoned—the first for not acquiescing in the new form of ordination, and the latter for not changing the altars of his diocese into tables, and for preaching against the change of religion. There was a spirit of unjust intolerance, and a system of oppressive harshness in these proceedings, which, though borrowed from the ancient system in which all had been educated, we cannot now consider without dislike, surprise, and condemnation." Mr. Froude, it may be added, censures Cranmer for the unjust mode in which Gardiner was treated on this occasion.

The reader will be interested to see Mr. Froude's summary of the effects of Somerset's first statute as Protector of the realm of England: "Two measures were passed this session (1547) which require attention. The vagrancy laws of the late reign were said to have failed from over severity. . . . Granting that it was permissible to treat the vagabond as a criminal in an age when transportation did not exist, and when public works on which he could be employed at the cost

<sup>s</sup> Turner's "History of England," vol. ii. pp. 258, 259.

of the Government were undertaken but rarely, the question what to do with him in such a capacity was a hard one. The compulsory idleness of a life in gaol was at once expensive and useless ; and, practically, the choice lay between no punishment at all, the cart's tail, and the gallows. The Protector, although his scheme proved a failure, may be excused for having attempted a novel experiment, for having invented an arrangement, the worst feature of which was an offensive name, and which, in fact, resembled the system which, till lately, was in general use in our own penal colonies. The object was, if possible, to utilize the rascal part of the population who were held to have forfeited, if not their lives, yet their liberties<sup>9</sup>. A servant determinately idle leaving his work, or an able-bodied vagrant roving the country without means of honest self-support, and without seeking employment, was to be brought before the two nearest magistrates. On proof of the idle living of the said person, he was *to be branded on the breast*, where the mark would be concealed by his clothes, with the letter V, and adjudged to some honest neighbour as a slave, to have and to hold the said slave for the space of two years then following, and to order the said slave as follows :—‘That is to say, to take such person adjudged as a slave with him, and only

<sup>9</sup> The men who are here stigmatized as “rascals and slaves” formed a large proportion of the small tenants and servants of the abbeys which had been recently broken up. They could procure no employment, although they had been long known as an honest and industrious class of people. In the former reign they were “hunted like wolves.” None of this hunting, enslaving, branding, whipping, and hanging would have been necessary but for the multitudinous robberies and sacrileges of King and nobles in despoiling the religious houses and seizing their lands.

giving the said slave bread and water, or small drink, and such refuse of meat as he shall think proper, to cause the said slave to work.' If mild measures failed, if the slave was still idle or ran away, he was to be marked on the cheek or forehead with an S, and be adjudged a slave for life. If finally refractory, then, and then only, he might be tried and sentenced as a felon. . . . Another measure, however, did not fail—unless, indeed, to accomplish unmixed evil be to fail. It has been mentioned that the year before the death of Henry the remaining property of all ecclesiastical and semi-ecclesiastical foundations, the lands, the rent charges, the miscellaneous donations for the support of universities, colleges, schools, hospitals, alms-houses, or parochial charities, for chantries, masses, ornaments for churches, and other useful purposes, were placed by Parliament in the hands of the King, to receive such alterations as the change of times required. . . . The preamble of the new Act, more explicit than that of the Act under Henry, stated that in times of superstition, when the perfect method of salvation was not understood, when men held vain opinions of purgatory, and masses satisfactory, they had established chantries, and such other institutions, thinking to benefit their souls. The funds so applied might be converted to good and godly uses. . . . The proposed changes were postponed by Parliament, and an uncontrolled confidence was reposed in the King's Council."

Mr. Fronde then describes the sacrilege which followed the confiscation of the Church lands: "The shrines and the altar plate at York Cathedral were sent to the Mint, to be issued in base coin; and, the example being contagious, parish vestries began to appropriate

the chalices, jewels, bells, and ornaments in the country churches, and offer them publicly for sale<sup>1</sup>. The carcase was cast out into the fields, and the vultures of all breeds and orders flocked to the banquet<sup>2</sup>."

But, in order to be more explicit, it is better to summarize this infamous statute, to show the English people the punishment to which the plunderers of the religious houses condemned the destitution which they themselves had occasioned. And it will also be remembered that the founders of the English Reformation were the makers of these barbarous laws: "Any man or woman," one of the statutes stated, "found suspiciously near any house, or wandering mysteriously by the highways, or in the streets of any city, town, or village, for three days together, without offering to work for the belly cheer which they required to sustain them, or running away from their labour, might be brought by the master, or any other person, before two squires who were justices of the peace; and the said justices having the power by statute law to exercise the said power by *burning into his or her breast with a hot iron the letter V*, and to adjudge him or her to be the slave of the informer—'to have and to hold the said slave to him, his executors or assigns, for the space of two years, only giving the said slave bread and water, and such refuse of meat as he shall think meet.' The master was empowered to cause the slave to work by '*beating, chaining*, or otherwise, in such work and labour, how vile soever it be, as he shall put him unto. If the slave found his service too hard, and ran away or absented himself for fourteen days without his

<sup>1</sup> Tanner MSS. Bodleian Library.

<sup>2</sup> Froude's "Hist. of England," vol. v. pp. 68—70.

master's leave, the master might punish him by *chains and beating*, and if he chose to prove the fault by two witnesses before two justices of the peace, the same justices shall cause such slave or loiterer to be marked on the forehead, or the ball of the cheek, with a hot iron, with the sign of an S, that he may be known for a loiterer and runaway, and shall adjudge the loiterer and runaway to be the said master's slave *for ever*. If the slave ran away or absented himself for the second time he was to be attainted, or otherwise condemned to suffer pains of death, as other felons ought to do.' Any manner of person was permitted to take children between five and fourteen years of age from any wayfaring beggar, whether the mother, nurse, or keeper of the child be willing or not. Taken before certain local authorities, they adjudged the child to be the servant or apprentice of him who brought it—if a boy, till he reached the age of nineteen, if a girl, to that of twenty.' If the child ran away from his master or mistress once or twice, "then it shall be lawful for every such master to take the said child again, and to keep and *punish the said child in chains or otherwise, and use him or her as his slave in all points*, for the time before rehearsed of the age of such child." Section 4 of this law gives permission to the masters of men or women who have been adjudged slaves, or of children who had been adjudged apprentices or servants, the power "*To let, set forth, sell, bequeath, or give the service of such slaves or servants to any person or persons whatsoever.*" It was declared lawful to every one owning a slave to put a ring of iron about his neck, arm, or his leg, for a more knowledge and surety of keeping of him. If any person assisted in the removal of one of these rings with-

out permission of the master, he was to forfeit ten pounds sterling.

Under laws like these the masses became reckless and debased. “Starved and half-naked men, women, and children” were to be seen in every end of London; thieving, drunkenness, and immoral practices “increased to a lamentable extent;” “diseases of the most virulent type preyed upon the poor; the hospitals were nearly all broken up and their property confiscated; the diseased creatures lay down in the streets or the nearest fields to die;” “there was no compassion for their sufferings;” “the ‘well-to-do’ and the wealthy seemed to have parted with that sympathy for the poor which once made them famous in the land;” “they now only thought of gathering more wealth and spending it on their own bodies;” “they were bent on the enslavement of the people, who in turn became furious, and, throwing off all religious control, entered the ale-house on Sundays, but alas! seldom went to church;” “they did not like the new priests, and the women swore mightie oaths that, since England was England they had never before known of the Saviour’s priests having wives and children;” “they did not go to Paul’s Cross to hear the Lord Cranmer or the Lord Ridley preach; they would sooner go to the ale-house<sup>3</sup>.” And go to the ale-house they did<sup>4</sup>. “The churches were desecrated daily, and nearly empty on Sundays, whilst those who had small sums of money crowded to places of immoral and abominable amuse-

<sup>3</sup> Nathan Wolci on the “Condytion of the Common People,” in King Edward’s time; Rodger Radcliffe on the “Condytion of the Countrie Parts.”

<sup>4</sup> Strong ale was 1½d. per gallon at this period in London; and wine one shilling for four quarts. Adulteration was unknown.

ments; the tide of crime flooded onward; the new preachers could make no impression on the lower classes; Latimer was the only Reformer whom they would hear; he sympathized with their sufferings and denounced the nobles for having seized so greedily on the property which was for the benefit of the poor.<sup>5</sup> But Latimer had no real influence with the people, nor perhaps any one of his party. Gilpin, who may be considered as one of the Reformers—and, indeed, one of the best of them—states that, “in Edward’s reign more blind superstition, ignorance, and infidelity was promulgated in England than ever was under the Bishop of Rome. The realm was in danger of becoming more barbarous than Scythia<sup>6</sup>.<sup>6</sup> Church livings were bestowed on men “who knew not what honesty, virtue, godliness, or Christian charity was; they did not even bear the outward semblance of priests or bishops. They were regarded as thieves and robbers, whose only study was to kill and destroy the people committed to their charge.” Society became completely rent asunder. Generosity, friendship, and charity received a shock; the children rose up against their parents; they claimed the “liberty of doing as they pleased.” Desolation overshadowed the land. Bradford has summed up the result of the “mighty changes” in Edward’s reign: “All men may see that immorality in its foulest forms, pride, dishonesty, unmercifulness, scoffing at religion and virtue, and a desire to oppress and crush down the poor, far surpassed at this time any thing that ever before occurred in the realm.”

<sup>5</sup> Bernard Gilpin’s “Sermons on the Crymes of the Realm.”

<sup>6</sup> “Sermons on Repentance;” Holinshed; Stow; Statutes of the

Mr. Froude philosophizes in eloquent terms over the infirmitiess of human nature at this period of England's history. He separates the wheat from the chaff, and arrives at the strange conclusion that the Reformers possessed whatever goodness or virtue remained in the realm. How singularly different is the opinion of writers who lived so many generations nearer the time and men treated of! Camden, Strype, and Burnet draw by no means a flattering picture of the character and conduct of the early Reformers; and, at present, Dr. Maitland, who has dedicated a long life to the investigation of MSS. and records bearing upon the movements of the English Reformers, has furnished the world with an analysis of their proceedings which few will question, and none can read with edification.

From Lord Russell down to Sir Anthony Kingston, the military agents chosen by the Duke of Somerset to promote the Reformation were men remarkable for cruelty. It would appear that Somerset had acted on the advice prescribed for him by Calvin, who writes, "Of all things let there be no *moderation*, it is the bane of genuine improvement<sup>7</sup>." To stigmatize the people of Devonshire as rebels was most unjust, and contrary to fact. They took up arms, not against the Tudor dynasty, but to vindicate the rights of conscience. They claimed the privilege of practising the religion their forefathers held for one thousand years; and this right was denied—the denial enforced by the sword—followed by penal proscriptions, previously unknown to Britons for injustice and cruelty. Among the demands

Realm; Latimer's Sermons in London; Statutes of Edward VI.; "Records of London Life, from 1547—55."

<sup>7</sup> "MS. Domestic, Edward VI." vol. v., 1548.

made by the Devonshire insurgents was one, that the Six Acts should be put in force, and the olden religion maintained. In the eighth demand they state, “We will not receive the new service because it is but like a Christmas game; but we will have our old Service of Latin Mass, Evening Song, and Procession in Latin, as it was before. And so we, the Cornish men, whereof certain of us understand no English, utterly refuse this *new English*.” But the demands were made in vain. After one of those massacres styled “a battle in Devonshire,” Dr. Coverdale preached “an evening thanksgiving sermon,” standing over the bodies of the slain, “as,” says Froude, “they lay with their stiffening limbs, and their faces to the stars.” There were many such scenes during Lord Russell’s campaign. Few, however, of the military commanders employed by the government of Edward VI. won such an unenviable notoriety as Sir Anthony Kingston, the Provost-marshall. This Kingston was a thoroughly mean, cruel, vindictive, dis honourable person; yet a distinguished writer of the present day says, “He was a young, high-spirited, and, in some respects, noble sort of person—a friend of Hooper the martyr.” Mr. Froude happens to be frequently mistaken as to the merits of several of his heroes. John Ulmis, in one of his Zurich letters, exposes something of the character of Kingston. He says, “Anthony Kingston, a man of rank in Gloucestershire, was cited to appear before Bishop Hooper, on a charge of adultery and other immoral practices. He was severely reprimanded by the bishop, to which he replied with abusive language, and so far forgot himself as to use blows in the Bishop’s court. Hooper reported the case to the Privy Council, and Sir Anthony

Kingston was fined 500*l.* for his conduct to Bishop Hooper." A strange kind of friend must a man like Kingston have been to Hooper. These allegations against Kingston are further corroborated by a recent biographer of Hooper.

In the reign of Queen Mary Sir Anthony Kingston returned to the olden religion, and was quite willing to act as provost-marshal at the execution of any of his former friends. As provost-marshal he went to Gloucester to see the "law fulfilled" in the case of Bishop Hooper, and had the audacity to visit that prelate the night before his death, and begged of him to "consult his own safety, and recant." "Consider," said this conscientious adviser, "that life is sweet and death is bitter." Hooper turned aside and treated his admonition with contempt. Lord Sussex and *his* provost-marshal, in their conduct towards the northern insurgents in the reign of Elizabeth, were angels of mercy in comparison with Lord Russell and Kingston. In fact, Russell seemed to delight in blood like a wild beast. His doings in Devonshire are almost incredible for their profuse bloodthirstiness.

Hooker, who was present at many of Lord Russell's massacres, describes them "as most horrible butcheries of brave men." Holinshed, Stowe, and other writers, confirm this statement. Russell's own "business-like" despatches to Somerset and the Council present a lamentable picture of the means by which the Reformation was first promoted in Devonshire and throughout Cornwall. One of the despatches states that prayers "were offered up every morning and evening" in the camp; and another "military letter" relates "how jolly the soldiers ate and drank," being supplied daily with

large numbers of sheep and fowl from the localities where the farmers and squires “ forfeited such property by their obstinate adherence to the Popish mass, and other superstitions condemned by the God-fearing Reformers.” Anthony Kingston, like many of his friends and contemporaries, ended his days miserably. Having been charged with secretly abetting treason against Queen Mary, he died at a roadside house on his route to London as a prisoner. He made enemies both of Reformers and Catholics, and in Devonshire his name was universally execrated. He had received from King Henry a considerable share of the monastic plunder.

Bishop Latimer, in his “ Royal Sermons,” ascribes all the poverty the people were then enduring to the “ new order of things.” He says his “ father was a yeoman who lived comfortably, educated his children, served the King, and gave to the poor, on a farm, the rent of which had been increased fourfold since, so that his successor in the farm became a mere pauper in comparison.” In another passage of his sermon he boldly gave the Seymours, the Dudleys, and the Pagets his opinion of the men who succeeded the monks as landlords: “ I fully certify you as extortioners, violent oppressors, engrossers of tenements and lands, through whose covetousness villages decay and fall down; and the King’s liege people, for lack of sustenance, are famished and decayed. . . . You landlords, yon rent-raisers, I may say, you step-lords, you unnatural lords, you have for your possessions yearly too much<sup>8</sup>! The

<sup>8</sup> There is now in the British Museum an MS. on the rental of the abbeys and convents, and the rents levied by the new landlords. According to this paper the rents were raised four times in twelve years. The annual entertainments given by the “ monkish landlords”

farm that was some years back from 20*l.* to 40*l.* by the year, is now charged to tenants at from 50*l.* to 100*l.* . . . Poor men cannot have a living, all kinds of victuals are so dear. I think, verily, that if it thus continue we shall at length be obliged to pay twenty shillings for a pig<sup>9</sup>. If ye bring it to pass that the yeomen be not able to put their sons to school, ye pluck salvation from the people, and utterly destroy the realm.” In another discourse he contrasts the interest taken in the education of the people by the monks and the Reformers. “In those days they (the monks) helped the scholars. They maintained and gave them living. . . . It is a pitiful thing to see schools so neglected; every true Christian ought to lament the same. To consider what has been plucked from abbeys, colleges, chantries, it is a marvel that no more is to be bestowed upon this holy office of salvation. . . . Scholars have no exhibition. Very few there be who help poor scholars, or set children to school to learn the Word of God, and make provision for the age to come. It would pity a man’s heart to hear what I have of the state of Cambridge. . . . I think there be at this day (1550) one thousand students less than were within twenty years, and fewer preachers<sup>1</sup>.”

The Rev. Mr. Blunt states that these “comparisons of the time, before and after the destruction of the abbeys, were wrung from Latimer by the bitter contemplation of the result as it stood visible to his eyes.”

Hume admits that the reforming spirit of the laity

to their tenants also went out of fashion, like many other good social customs of Old England.

<sup>9</sup> Pork was  $\frac{3}{4}d.$  per pound in London in the days of Wolsey.

<sup>1</sup> Latimer’s “Sermons before King Edward VI.”

was excited by the prospect of pillaging the secular, as they had already done the regular clergy, and they knew that while the principles of the olden religion prevailed they could not succeed<sup>2</sup>.

How did the great lay Reformer, Somerset, and his coadjutors influence the conduct of high and low amongst a people whom he compelled to adopt his innovations? and what effect had the boasted dissemination of the so-called “pure Gospel” amongst the laity, nobles, and people? In the second year of Edward’s reign (1549) the condition of public morals in England, it is stated on undeniable Protestant authority, had become horrible. Adultery, we find, seemed a frequent and cherished practice amongst those who should have set an example of virtue: so much indeed did the crime abound, that the King’s council contemplated bringing the question before Parliament. The reader now-a-days may set down the social state of England as being far from exaggerated, when it is remembered that of public morals at this period the picture is drawn by such a hero-worshipper of the “men and women of the Reformation” as John Strype. Strype says, “About this time the nation grew infamous for the crime of adultery. It began among the nobility and better classes, and so spread at length among the inferior sort of people. Noblemen would frequently put away their wives and marry others, if they liked another woman better, or were like to obtain wealth by her. And they would sometimes pretend their former wives to be false to them, and so be divorced, and marry again those whom they might fancy. The first occasion of this seemed to be in the Earl of Northampton divorcing

<sup>2</sup> Hume, vol. iii. (folio ed.) p. 294; Heylin, Goodwin’s Annals.

himself from his first wife Anne, daughter of the Earl of Essex, and afterwards marrying Elizabeth, daughter to the Lord Cobham. In like manner, Henry, son of William, Earl of Pembroke, put away Catherine, daughter of Henry, Duke of Suffolk, and married Mary, daughter of Sir Henry Sidney. These adulteries and divorces increased very much ; *yea, and marrying again without any divorce at all, it became a great scandal to the realm, and to the religion professed in it.* This state of morals gave much sorrow and trouble to good men to see it ; in so much that they thought necessary to move for an Act of Parliament to punish adultery with death. This Latimer, in a sermon preached in the year 1550, signified to the King : “ For the love of God, take an order for marriage here in England<sup>3</sup>.”

The distinguished secretary of Sir William Cecil, who was most probably an eye-witness of the scenes enacted under Somerset’s rule, states that, “ Sacrilegious avarice ravenously invaded church livings, colleges, chantries, hospitals, and places dedicated to the poor, as things superfluous. Ambition and emulation among the nobility, presumption and disobedience among the common people, grew so extravagant, that England seemed to be in a downright frenzy<sup>4</sup>. ”

Things must, indeed, have been in a terrible plight when Burnet is compelled by the power of truth to make the following acknowledgment of the moral and social plague which had been introduced by the leading Reformers. “ This gross and insatiable scramble,” Burnet observes, “ after the goods and wealth that had been dedicated to good designs, without the applying

<sup>3</sup> Strype’s “ Memorials of Archbishop Cranmer,” vol. i. p. 293, 294.

<sup>4</sup> Camden’s “ Chronicle on Edward’s Reign.”

any part of it to promote the good of the Gospel, the instruction of the poor, made all people conclude that it was *for robbery, and not for reformation*, that their zeal made them so active. *The irregular and immoral lives of many of the professors of the Gospel gave their enemies great advantage to say, that they ran away from confession, penance, fasting, and prayer, only to be under no restraint, and to indulge themselves in a licentious and dissolute course of life.* By these things, that were but too visible in some of the most eminent among them, the people were much alienated from them; and, as much as they were formerly against Popery, they grew to have kinder thoughts of it, and to look on all the changes that had been made as designs to *enrich some vicious characters, and to let in an inundation of vice and wickedness upon the nation*<sup>5</sup>.”

Dr. Ridley, when Bishop of London (1548), wrote a book entitled “The Lamentations of England,” in which a frightful picture is drawn of immorality, abominable crimes, oppression, pride, hatred, and scorn of religion and its ministers amongst the people, especially the upper classes. Archbishop Cranmer preached at Paul’s Cross an eloquent sermon on the same subject, but the populace would not hear him; they scoffed at his discourse. Under any circumstances, Cranmer was never popular in London. His manner of addressing the populace was cold and repulsive. The homely style and vulgar wit of Latimer gained him a warm reception at Paul’s Cross from “the idle spectators,” but he possessed not the power of turning them from the “error of their way.”

Such was the condition of once happy England, after

<sup>5</sup> Burnet’s “History of the Reformation,” first edition.

two years' rule under the great lay Reformer, Edward Seymour, Duke of Somerset, whose death, Miss Strickland states, "all Protestants deeply lamented, as the *real founder of the Church of England*."<sup>6</sup>

#### CRANMER'S POLICY IN THE REIGN OF EDWARD VI.

To Cranmer was due the importation of a foreign element into the Reformation. What has been called a reform was thus made a revolution—an overthrow of long-standing rights, a confiscation of the heritage of the people. Cranmer, in his attempt to assimilate the English Reformation to the Continental type, introduced the doctrines of the Continental revolutionists; and, worse still, appointed Peter Martyr and Martin Bucer to professorships of "divinity" in Cambridge and Oxford. The gloomy theology of Calvin, also, he sought to engraft—and too successfully—on the "new learning," but the fact of importing foreign fanatics and unbelievers to act as teachers amongst the unsophisticated English people was one of the most evil performances of an unprincipled life. On the Continent the Reformation, from starting as an alleged correction of "misdeeds in religious matters," became an overthrow of property—a political *bouleversement*; it excited the masses to rebel against their Princes, led to the Anabaptist horrors of Munster, as well as to the fires lit in England by alternate bigotry, malice, and revenge.

One of the first public acts of Archbishop Cranmer at the accession of King Edward, was when he appeared as Papal and Anti-Papal Archbishop at the Coronation,

<sup>6</sup> "Queens of England," vol. iii. p. 287.

celebrating Mass, High Mass, and other ceremonies of the Roman Church. The following is a description of the ceremony as presided over by the great reforming Archbishop :—“The procession from the Tower to the Palace of Westminster was of the most magnificent description. None of the vestments of the clergy were set aside. The suffragans of Canterbury, all mitred, and in rich copes, walked two-and-two, attended by their apparitors and chaplains, preceding Archbishop Cranmer, who walked alone. Over his scarlet rochet Cranmer wore an embroidered cope; the train of which was borne by gentlemen of his household; the mitre upon his head was resplendent with jewels; before him was borne erect his crozier, the cross of Canterbury. At the Abbey door they were met by the clergy of the Cathedral, with the members and children of their choir, and those of the Chapel Royal, then as now, arrayed in scarlet tunics beneath their surplices or albs.” A quaint writer of a briefly later day, says :—“First there was a goodly stage richly hanged with cloth of gold and cloth of arras, and the steps from the choir contained two-and-twenty steps of height, and down to the high altar but fifteen steps, goodly carpeted, where the King’s grace should tread with his nobles. Secondly—The high altar richly garnished with divers and costly jewels and ornaments of much estimation and value; and also the tombs on each side the high altar, richly hanged with fine gold and arras. Thirdly—In the midst of the stage was a goodly thing made of seven steps in height, where the King’s Majesty’s chair-royal stood; and he sat therein after he was crowned, all the mass while. Fourthly—At nine of the clock all Westminster choir was in their copes,

and three goodly crosses borne before them, and after them other three goodly rich crosses, and the King's chapel, with his children following, all in scarlet, with surplices and copes on their backs ; and after them ten bishops in scarlet, with their rochets and rich copes on their backs, and their mitres on their heads, did set forth at the west door of Westminster, towards the King's palace, there to receive his Grace and my lord of Canterbury (Cranmer), with his cross before him alone, and his mitre on his head<sup>7</sup>."

Some of the costly vestments worn by the Archbishop on this occasion, were actually presents from the Roman Pontiff. When the homage was done, Archbishop Cranmer himself ascending the great altar, sang the mass of the Holy Ghost, the choir accompanying him, and the organs playing. After the elevation of the Host, the Archbishop paused, and the Lord Chancellor read a general pardon granted by King Henry VIII. to all who had offended before the 28th of January<sup>8</sup>. The address, not a sermon, delivered by Cranmer on this occasion, was singularly antagonistic to the principles supposed to be held by an Archbishop who had just "sung" the High Mass, and anointed the young monarch. Perhaps Strype may be considered the most "Protestant authority" on this subject. At p. 144 of Strype's "Cranmer," the Archbishop addressing the King says:—"These solemn rites serve to admonish you of the duties which you have to perform as God's vicegerent and Christ's vicar (a boy not ten years old), to see that God be worshipped and idolatry destroyed ; that the tyranny of the Bishop of Rome be banished,

<sup>7</sup> Strype's "Memorials."

<sup>8</sup> Hook's "Archbishops of Canterbury," vol. vi. p. 233.

and images removed.” The Archbishop next recommended the study of virtue, morality, and charity; to relieve the poor, to repress violence, and execute justice. The puzzled mind of a conscientious inquirer stops short at this seemingly impassable barrier. The Archbishop was within one hour a Roman Catholic and a Puritan—an “idol-reverer and an iconoclast.” A world of inconsistency was compressed within compass of those altar steps, on which he swore by his words to a testimony which he afterwards proved to be perjury by his actions. If he had been consistent, men might not be called upon to recollect that, whilst a prisoner in the Tower some seven years later, he wrote a memorable letter to the Dean and Chapter of Canterbury, denouncing as the invention of the father of lies the very Mass which he sang, with so much apparent piety, at the coronation of King Edward. It is said that Archbishop Cranmer was *not* a Protestant at this period; and Dean Hook wishes to impress on his readers that, “although at the accession of King Edward, Cranmer was a Reformer, he was not even yet a Protestant.” And the learned Dean again observes, “The question may indeed fairly be asked whether in the modern acceptation of the term a Protestant he ever became.” Dean Hook remarks:—“It was unfortunate that he (Cranmer) was ever created Archbishop of Canterbury.” This implies an excuse for the arguments put forth by the Dean himself, in defence, or, at least, in mitigation, of Cranmer’s conduct as Archbishop of Canterbury. Surely the deduction is fair.

Although Archbishop Cranmer did so much to promote the Reformation in the reign of Edward, Somerset, the layman, was a far more advanced Protestant than

the prelate. The Protector had certainly more material reasons for his conversion, and he was as conscientious as his coadjutor. The Archbishop still adhered, with some modifications, to the Papal doctrine on Purgatory, prayers for the dead, &c., and on several occasions offered up Mass for the repose of the souls of Henry VIII. and Francis I.<sup>9</sup>

The reader is aware of the part taken by the Archbishop during the funeral obsequies of Queen Jane. He made himself remarkable on that occasion, eliciting the praise of the King for the “interest he took in the eternal repose of the Queen’s soul.” He celebrated no less than forty masses himself for the Queen, for which he received the usual royal offering in gold and silver.

By one section of Cranmer’s ecclesiastical code, he inflicted a fine of ten shillings and ten days’ imprisonment on those who did not abstain from meat on Fridays and Saturdays, and the eves of saints’ days, also in Advent and Lent. He likewise held that the presence of images of saints in the churches was “a constant sermon to the eyes of the ignorant and unlettered.” This opinion was propounded more forcibly by Luther, even after his change. But then Luther put forth no settled code of faith. He was a seceder, without being an organizer. The alterations he made have been enlarged by his so-called followers, and may be so to the end of time. The opinions here expressed by Cranmer and Luther are those promulgated by the Council of Trent.

The more the reader recurs to the policy and conduct of Cranmer in the reign of Henry VIII. the more marvel arises at the reputation which has been accorded

<sup>9</sup> “Archbishops of Canterbury,” vol. vi. p. 226.

to his character. In 1537, as the reader is aware, a book was compiled by King Henry's command, entitled "the Bishop's Book," which was arranged by a Council of Prelates, presided over by Archbishop Cranmer, at Lambeth Palace. In this work the Archbishop himself contends for the sacrament of penance, and the necessity of auricular confession; and, further, he directs the bishops and clergy to "enforce the same" in their respective dioceses<sup>1</sup>. He was at this time the colleague and friend of Lord Cromwell.

In Edward the Sixth's reign Cranmer published a catechism for the "Goodlie Benefit, Profit, and Instruction of Children and Young People." It is rather a remarkable document. It admits that the veneration of the Cross, and the reverence to the images of saints, as reminders of the virtues of those who were therein represented, to "teache them good lyves," (what has been called the adoration of images); of the prohibition of false gods and of idols, as retained from the Hebrew dispensation—and showing the difference therein between the Jewish and Christian law. The catechism also taught that in the communion "the body and blood of Christ are received with the 'bodily mouth';" inculcates in strong terms the advantages of "confession and absolution," and attributes the origin of ecclesiastical jurisdiction to Christ the Redeemer, in a mode which appears subversive of his former opinion on the same subject<sup>2</sup>. But enough of the marvellous inconsistency of this prelate; from whose writings, in fact, a man can as easily prove one observance as another. Dean Hook admits that the Archbishop had no theo-

<sup>1</sup> Collier, Heylin, and Hook.

<sup>2</sup> Burnet, ii. 71; Collier, ii. 251.

logical principle to guide him in his preparation for future reforms; but that the “marriage of the clergy was a measure nearest to his heart.” Of course.

The research of the Rev. Dr. Brewer amongst the State Papers and records of the sixteenth century presents Cranmer’s “exertions for the marriage of the clergy” in an unpopular light. “A married clergyman,” he says, “was of rare occurrence either in England or Ireland in the sixteenth century.” “The people,” he observes, “had not yet lost the notion, with which they had long been familiarized, that the celibacy of the clergy was indispensable to their sacred functions.” In the reign of Elizabeth concubinage was frequent amongst the “Reformed clergy”—partly, it is alleged, “owing to the want of sufficient means to marry, or a fear of “the Queen’s resentment, who would not permit a priest to marry.” It may be added here, that if Cranmer had been spared by Mary, he would never have been an Archbishop with Elizabeth.

In Edward’s reign Archbishop Cranmer and his colleagues were frequently embarrassed by the Reforming clergy preaching the revolutionary opinions, which they themselves secretly encouraged in the former reign. They had now to contend against doctrines which could not fail to sap the foundations of society, and perhaps overthrow the monarchy itself. Some of the preachers told the people that a prohibition of bigamy was a pure Popish invention; that it was “right lawful” for any man if he thought proper, to have one or two wives, and for the wife to have one or more husbands if she so wished. Other preachers declared that to admit the government of a king was to reject the laws of God; that children baptized in infancy should be afterwards

re-baptized ; that "human laws were not to be obeyed ;" that no "Christian ought to bear any office in the commonwealth ;" that oaths are unlawful ; that Christ did not take flesh of the Virgin ; that sinners cannot be restored to grace by repentance ; and that all things, *all property, are, and ought to be in common use*<sup>3</sup>. This was the communism which Cranmer took a main part in importing with the felonious foreigners whom he patronized.

Cranmer, assisted by Ridley, Latimer, and Coverdale, sat on a commission to investigate and punish those who erred against the principles laid down by himself and Poynt in the newly prepared book of Common Prayer. Henry Champneys, a "reformed priest," was the first offender brought before the Commissioners. He maintained that Christ was not God ; that grace was inadmissible, and that the regenerate, though they might fall by the outward, could never sin by the inward, man ; Puttow, a tanner, Jacob Thumb, a butcher, and a priest named Aston, who had embraced Unitarianism, stood condemned by Archbishop Cranmer ; but the terror of the stake, stronger than conviction, induced them to abjure their opinions. They were sworn before the Commissioners to "abandon such wicked doctrines, and condemned to stand publicly at St. Paul's Cross during a sermon, with the faggots in hand, which were to light the fire around their corrupt bodies in Smithfield."

The most remarkable person tried for heresy was Anne Boucher, a young lady of considerable talent and personal attractions. She had been an active co-

<sup>3</sup> State Papers, 3 Edward VI. ; Strype, ii. p. 12, 90 ; Rym. xv. p. 181, 250.

partner of Anne Askew in distributing prohibited books, some few years before, to the ladies of the Court. Her clerical judges were Latimer and Cranmer. One of the principal charges against her was that of maintaining that “Christ did not take flesh of the outward man of the Virgin, because the outward man was conceived in sin, but by the consent of the inward man, which was undefiled.” She held many other unintelligible opinions; it was evident that she had lost her reason, but Cranmer did not care for that, and he excommunicated her as an “obstinate heretic.” It therefore remained for the King to order her execution at the stake. When receiving judgment, Anne Boucher addressed Archbishop Cranmer in the following words: “My Lord of Canterbury, it is a good matter to consider your ignorance. It was not long ago that *you* yourself burnt Anne Askew for a piece of bread; and yet came *yourself* soon afterwards to believe and profess the same doctrine for which you burnt her; and now, forsooth, *you* will needs burn me for a piece of flesh, and in the end will come to believe this also, when you have read the Scriptures and understand them<sup>4</sup>.” All these mad theories arose from promiscuous reading of the Scriptures by the weak-minded or ignorant. In fact, reading the Bible “without note or comment” is incompatible with any positive or settled religion.

Anne Boucher’s execution was delayed for nearly a year before King Edward consented to send her to the stake. Like his father, he had the vanity to assume the character of a theologian. He had a “compassion for the future condition of her soul, if she died holding

<sup>4</sup> Strype’s “Memorials;” Collier, vol. vi.; Lingard, vol. v.

those heretical opinions ; that she would be consigned to everlasting torments.” On these grounds he refused his assent. Cranmer, however, was determined that his own judgment should be carried out. He argued the question with the King. He showed the “expediency of maintaining the spiritual supremacy of the Crown ;” he cited examples from Scripture, producing that of Moses, who had condemned blasphemers to be stoned to death<sup>5</sup>. Young Edward, who was an ardent admirer of Moses, was at once brought to his Primate’s views of the question. Still he hesitated, and is said to have “shed tears on signing the warrant to burn the poor maiden alive.” It is stated that when Cranmer impressed upon the King the necessity of the execution, Edward said solemnly, “Then let the responsibility of this action rest on thee, my Lord of Canterbury<sup>6</sup>. ” The “Reformed Bishops” of London and Ely made an attempt to change the opinions of Anne Boucher, but in vain. She professed to know more of the question at issue “than all the Reformers in the realm.” A contemporary says, “Her conduct at the stake was remarkable for heroic courage ; she did not seem mad or out of her wits, but appears to have been a self-willed, vain, and fanatic woman, who studied learning beyond her comprehension. Her execution presented a horrible scene. The poor creature suffered dreadfully.” Scory, one of the new preachers, undertook to refute her “religious notions” at the stake, as was then the custom ; but she briefly replied, that “he lied like a rogue, and had better go home and study the Scripture<sup>7</sup>. ” Such scenes were frequent in those days.

<sup>5</sup> Collier, Burnet, Lingard.<sup>6</sup> Tytler’s “Edward and Mary.”

<sup>7</sup> Wilkins “Corr.” i. v. 42, 43 ; King Edward’s “Journal,” p. 12.

Several of Cranmer's early biographers—perhaps under the inspiration of Maister Foxe—contend that he had nothing whatever to do with the condemnation and execution of Anne Boucher. Strype (p. 473) alleges that Archbishop Cranmer “was not present at her condemnation ;” and infers that he was probably no party to it; but then, as Cranmer was Metropolitan, the prosecution for heresy could not take place without his sanction. On religious or political questions the Archbishop held the highest position in the Council. The best answer to Cranmer's advocates in this case is to be found in fol. 74, 75 of the Archbishop of Canterbury's own Register, which states that “he (Cranmer) *was present, and pronounced the judgment against the said Anne Boucher.*”

Here is the opinion of one of the latest investigators of Cranmer's persecuting policy in Edward's reign:—“In the case of Ann Boucher,” writes Dean Hook, “the Archbishop of Canterbury was the judge who sentenced her to death, and so far from being ashamed of it, the whole process, together with others of the same kind, ranging over four years from 1548 to 1552, *is narrated in Cranmer's own Register<sup>s</sup>.*” In the commission for the trial of Anne Boucher, we find the name of Hugh Latimer, as well as that of “Thomas, by *divine permission*, Archbishop of Canterbury and Metropolitan of England.” In Canterbury Dr. Cranmer inflicted a barbarous punishment upon a poor man of whom he complained to the Privy Council. The offence was that of having forged a letter to obtain the office of headsman to the City of Canterbury. The Council

<sup>s</sup> Cranmer's “Register,” fol. 74; “Archbishops of Canterbury,” vol. vii. p. 69.

ordered the Archbishop to cause one of the criminal's ears to be nailed to the pillory on the next market-day, and for the said criminal to remain in that situation during the time the said market was held, with a paper declaring his offence in large letters placed on the front of his head. The Archbishop of Canterbury *obeyed the order*<sup>9</sup>." And most probably did right in the case.

In the face of these authentic statements, Cranmer's biographers consider that "he was not vindictive nor evil-minded, but rather kind-hearted."

Von Parris, a Dutch surgeon, who denied the Divinity of Christ, was also put to death by Cranmer. His judges were, Cranmer, Ridley, and Coverdale. In this case Cranmer gave judgment also, and in a few days Parris was "committed to the flames"<sup>1</sup>." Many "fanatical" persons were banished; others tortured; and others again abjured their opinions; the lower classes, who declaimed in their own rude fashion against the suppression of "their Latin Mass," were hunted down by foreign mercenaries, or silenced by the stocks or the lash; whilst the prelacy and the educated laity, who adhered to the olden faith, were consigned to the Tower or the Fleet, with an order from the Archbishop of Canterbury to the gaolers, that they "were to have neither pen, ink, nor paper, and no visitors save the warder." It has been repeatedly asserted that Cranmer's spiritual labours in Edward's reign were those of a "primitive Apostle," who was filled with all the beatitudes, and abhorred persecution. Let the reader cast an honest eye over the pages of this history, and

<sup>9</sup> "Proceedings of Privy Council," fol. 117, 118.

<sup>1</sup> Wilkins' "Corr." ii. 44, 45; Stowe, 606; Edwards' "Journal," p. 24.

consider the character of the witnesses and authorities produced, and then draw his own conclusions. Marvellous, indeed, has been the credulity of our fathers.

The question may be asked, could Archbishop Cranmer in any way prevent the contemptible peculation so notoriously carried on by King Edward's Government? He was a leading member of the Council; and we have sought in vain amongst the "Minutes and Records" of the King's Council of that period for any remonstrance or protest from the Archbishop of Canterbury against proceedings that have covered with odium and contempt the memory of every member of that body. Hume indignantly denounces them as "plunderers who neglected not even smaller things." But the meanest of their actions was that of "stripping" the gold, silver, and other ornaments off the missals and learned books in public libraries. The pretext for so doing was that those books "were filled with Popish superstitions," upon which Hume has well remarked that the "finery" about the books perhaps contained *the* "superstition." In 1551 an order was issued by the King's Council for "purging the library of Westminster of all missals, legends, and other superstitious books," and "delivering over their ornamentations" to Sir Anthony Anchier. A large number of those books were plated with gold and silver of the most ingenious Venetian workmanship<sup>2</sup>. In Oxford library every ornament of value was carried away; as to rare or learned books, they were considered of no value at all; books and manuscripts were destroyed without distinction<sup>3</sup>. The "volumes of

<sup>2</sup> Collier, vol. vi.; also the Council book of entries.

<sup>3</sup> Wood's "Hist. and Antiq. of Oxon.," lib. i. p. 271, 272; Hume, vol. iii. (fol. ed.) p. 334.

divinity," says Hume, "suffered for their rich binding, and those of literature were condemned as useless." Let it be remembered that those deeds of Vandalism were not perpetrated by ignorant people, or fanatical mobs; but by the order of the King's Council, composed of such men as the Earl of Warwick, Sir William Paget, Archbishop Cranmer, and Chancellor Rich.

## THE SEYMOUR SCANDAL.

THE attention of Somerset and his council was suddenly turned to the mysterious rumours afloat respecting young Elizabeth and Sir Thomas Seymour.

Katherine Ashley, the Princess Elizabeth's governess, in one of her depositions before the Council, stated her conviction that had Henry VIII. lived, he would have given Elizabeth in marriage to Thomas Seymour. Leti, in his history of those transactions gives the correspondence which passed between the Princess and Seymour a few weeks after Henry's death. The Princess was then only fourteen, and must have been more terrified than rejoiced when Seymour asked her at once to marry. The "frightened fawn" shied at the contemplation of so serious an engagement, and in her refusal informs her wooer, "that she has neither the years nor the inclination to think of marriage at present, and that she would not have any one imagine that such a subject had even been mentioned to her, at a time when she ought to be wholly taken up in weeping for the death of the King her father, to whom she owed so many obligations, and that she intended to devote at least two years to wearing black for him, and mourning for his loss; and that even when she shall have arrived at

years of discretion, she wishes to retain her liberty, without entering into any matrimonial engagement.” A sensible statement from one so young.

Great as the prize appeared then, and immeasurably greater as it proved to be, his rejection by the Princess seemed far from breaking Seymour’s heart. He at once transferred his addresses, if not affections, to the still blooming Catherine Parr, whom her last perilous venture in marriage did not deter from accepting a fourth partner; and within a few weeks of Elizabeth’s refusal, the dowager Queen and the Admiral were made one in wedlock.

When “a blooming girl of fifteen,” the Council of Edward VI. placed Elizabeth under the charge of her step-mother the queen-dowager (Catherine Parr), as a person well “competent and zealous” for instructing her in the tenets of the Reformation. At this period, Catherine Parr was married to Admiral Seymour. The grave, prudish Catherine thoughtlessly encouraged her handsome husband to “romp about house and gardens” with Lady Elizabeth; but those “amusements became rather serious,” and it was judged prudent by Catherine Parr to remove Elizabeth, for, as far as her husband was concerned, she “had some reason to complain.” The Lords of the Council investigated the case, and Mrs. Ashley, the governess to Lady Elizabeth, gave the following account to the Privy Council, with regard to Seymour’s “flirtations” with the young Princess and her maids:—

“At Chelsea, after my Lord Thomas Seymour was married to the Queen (Catherine Parr), he would come many mornings into the said Lady Elizabeth’s chamber before she was ready, and sometimes before she did

rise, and if she were up he would bid her good-morrow, and ax how she did, and strike her on the back familiarly, and so go forth to his chamber, and sometimes go through to her maidens, and play with them. If the Princess were in bed, he would put open the curtains and bid her good-morrow, and then she would go further into the bed ; and one morning he tried to kiss the Princess in her bed, and as this deponent was there, we bade him go away for shame. At Hanworth, for two mornings the Queen was with him, and they both tickled my Lady Elizabeth in her bed. He romped with her in the garden, and cut her gown, being black cloth, into a hundred pieces, and when Mrs. Ashley came up and chid Lady Elizabeth, she answered, ‘she could not strive with all, for the Queen held her while the Lord Admiral cut her dress.’ At another time, Lady Elizabeth heard the master-key unlock, and knowing my Lord Admiral would come in, ran out of her bed to her young maidens, and then went behind the curtain of her bed, and my lord tarried a long time in hopes she would come out. Mrs. Ashley could not tell how long<sup>4</sup>. . . . The governess of the Lady Elizabeth having heard stories of other flirtations with a young page, reproved her in severe language. Elizabeth wept bitterly, and assured her that those tales, like many others, were false.

“ It is possible,” writes Miss Strickland, “ that the actual guilt incurred by the unhappy Queen, Catherine Howard, in her girlhood, did not amount to a greater degree of impropriety than the unseemly romping which

<sup>4</sup> Haynes’ “ State Papers ;” Ellis’s “ Letters ;” Statute of Realm ; Tytler’s “ Edward and Mary ;” Strype’s “ Memorials ;” “ Queens of England,” vol. v. ; Lingard, vol. v.

took place almost every day at Chelsea, between the youthful Elizabeth and the bold bad husband of Catherine Parr<sup>5</sup>.” In case Seymour’s projects respecting Elizabeth failed, he intended to marry Lady Jane Grey, which proves that he contemplated an alliance with royalty at any hazard<sup>6</sup>.

On occasion of those scandals, the young Princess wrote a letter to Somerset, demanding an investigation into her character, and the concluding passage proclaims the challenge of indignant virtue:—“ Maister Tyrwhitt and others have told me, that there goeth rumours abroad which be greatly both against my honour and honesty (which above all things I esteem), which be these: that I am in the Tower and with child by my Lord Admiral. My Lord, these are shameful slanders, for the which, beside the desires I have to see the King’s majesty, I shall most humbly desire your lordship that I may come to the court after your first determination, that I may show myself there as I am<sup>7</sup>.” That Elizabeth entertained some affection for Sir Thomas Seymour is beyond doubt; but there is no proof of any criminality. She was neither “wanton nor amorous” in her looks at the period, but manifested the qualities of a good-natured, modest, warm-hearted girl; who was not, it is true, indifferent to the admiration and worship of her two handsome pages—namely Griffin and Aubrey. Party spirit at this time construed every action of the Princess in the worst sense. The young King Edward seems to have believed the story of her criminality with Seymour, for he

<sup>5</sup> “Queens of England,” vol. v. p. 116.

<sup>6</sup> Sir Haris Nicholas’s “Memorials of Jane Grey,” p. 18.

<sup>7</sup> State Papers of Edward VIth’s reign.

refused to see her. On the other hand it cannot be forgotten that those immediately about the King had potent reasons for defaming the reputation of both Mary and Elizabeth. One sister was represented to Edward as a “Popish bigot,” and the other as “wanton and amorous.” If Mary was a bigot she was made so by the example of those Reformers who condemned in others that want of charity which characterised their own proceedings. As to Elizabeth at this critical juncture, posterity should regard her acts with forbearance, and accept the statements of her enemies with hesitation and distrust.

Lady Fitzwalter observes that Elizabeth appeared to be an innocent, good-natured girl at this period, but showed a disposition to be a coquette like her mother. Mrs. Ashley’s husband, who was a relative of Anna Boleyn, states that he believed the Lady Elizabeth had a secret affection for the handsome Thomas Seymour, as she blushed whenever he mentioned the name of the frolicsome Admiral. Elizabeth herself told Parry, the manager of her household, that “she feared the Admiral loved her but too well, and that the Queen was jealous of them both ; and on one occasion, she came suddenly upon them when they were alone, he having her in his arms.”

Subsequent to these scandals, the Princess Elizabeth became most studious, “spending hours daily at her books ;” then regulating and settling the disputes that might occur amongst her domestics ; and, another pleasing feature in her character, presiding at the wedding of some favourite servant ; or giving interviews to the humbler folk in the vicinity of her residence ; listening to their household grievances ; relieving

their wants ; and receiving the visits of her little god-children, for whom, like her sister Mary, she entertained an affectionate regard. Christmas brought its labours and its pleasures to Elizabeth. For weeks preceding that great festival, she and her maidens worked cheerfully to prepare warm clothing for the poor children in the neighbourhood of Hunsdon and Hatfield. When evening came, she sat in the centre of the “ eight young maidens,” who were her dear companions, and the scene was enlivened by the presence of Blanche Parry, who related the “ latest gossip from London town;” and when retiring to her chamber for the night, she kissed these loved companions and said something kindly to each. Although Elizabeth’s means were very limited at this period, she nevertheless kept Christmas like a worthy daughter of England’s Royalty. “ My good Lady Elizabeth,” says Roger Ascham, “ keeps old Christmas right royally ; a great abundance of good eating and drinking, dancing and singing in right merrie style for the twelve days of Christmas. My good young lady Elizabeth speaketh to every one, even the humblest tiller of the soil : and she says unto them, ‘ there is no lack of belly-cheer in my house ; come in, eat, drink, and be merrie, because it is Christmas time.’ ”

When summer came, the Lady Elizabeth, her two pretty pages, the “frisky young maidens,” and Blanche Parry, wandered through fields and dells, in quest of honey and wild flowers—a rustic amusement in which the Princess felt much pleasure. This was the period in Elizabeth’s life which interests us most, as it was the most innocent, and displayed qualities which the ambition and passions of her regal life seem to have

utterly defaced. The youth of Elizabeth is the only phase of her existence to be dwelt on with pleasure; and she really seems to have been at this time a kind-hearted and loveable maiden.

In 1548 Lady Seymour, historically known as Catherine Parr, died in childbirth of her first born. If we can judge by some statements in Hayne's State Papers, Catherine before her death informed the private friends around her that "the Lord Admiral wished her death, and that she hinted young Elizabeth was the cause of it." Seymour visited her during her last illness, and Lady Tyrwhitt, who was present, alleges that "sharp words were uttered by the wife against the husband." Lady Tyrwhitt further affirms that the ex-Queen told her many things, but was emphatic in saying, "I am not well handled<sup>8</sup>." This sentence is supposed to convey an idea of her having been neglected by the doctors at the suggestion of her husband. On the other hand, Catherine is said to have been "in a delirium" when she made these statements to Lady Tyrwhitt. Be that as it may, she had formed a bad opinion of Seymour's constancy as a husband. The Reformers declared that the Queen was poisoned by the "Admiral to please the Papists." There is no proof of this allegation, none whatever; it was merely a party cry; perhaps got up by the partisans of the Protector, Somerset. Catherine was thirty-six years of age at the period of her death; and was long lamented by the clerical Reformers and the "Hot Gospel men" of the times. Bishop Parkhurst was her most enthusiastic panegyrist.

Catherine Parr was interred in the chapel of Sudely. In 1782 some "antiquarian ladies" discovered the

<sup>8</sup> Hayne's "State Papers," Queens of England, vol. 5.

“exact whereabouts,” not more than two feet from the surface. The body was wrapped in cere cloth. The features, particularly the eyes, were in a perfect state of preservation. Curiosity gratified, the grave was closed up again. A farmer, named Lucas, subsequently opened the grave and describes the body as still perfect.

“The repose of the buried Queen,” says Miss Strickland, “was again rudely violated by ruffian hands, in the spring of 1784, when the royal remains were taken out of the coffin, and thrown on a heap of rubbish and exposed to public view. An ancient woman who was present on that occasion, assured my friend, Miss Jane Porter, some years afterwards, that the remains of costly burial clothes were on the body, not a shroud but a dress, as if in life; shoes were on the feet, which were very small, and all her proportions extremely delicate; and she particularly noticed that traces of beauty were still perceptible in the countenance, of which the features were at that time perfect, but, by exposure to the air and other injurious treatment, the process of decay rapidly commenced. Through the interference of the vicar, the body was re-interred. In October, 1786, a scientific exhumation was made by the Rev. Tredway Nash, F.A.S., and his interesting and valuable report has been published in the “*Archæologia*,” from which the following abstract is given:—“In 1786, October 14, having obtained leave of Lord Rivers, the owner of Sudely Castle, with the Hon. J. Somers Cocks, the writer proceeded to examine the chapel. Upon opening the ground, and tearing up the lead, the face was found totally decayed; the teeth, which were sound, had fallen. The body was perfect, but in delicacy they

forbore to uncover it. Her hands and nails were entire, of a brownish colour. The Queen must have been of low stature, as the lead that enclosed her corpse was just five feet four inches long. The cere cloth consisted of many folds of linen, dipped in wax, tar, and gums, and the lead fitted exactly to the shape of the body.” The last time the coffin of Catherine Parr was opened, it was discovered that a wreath of ivy had entwined itself round the temples of the corpse, a berry having fallen there and taken root at the time of her previous exhumation, and there had silently, from day to day, woven itself into this green sepulchral coronal. Miss Strickland says, “a lock of hair which was taken from the head of Queen Catherine Parr, after it had lain in the dust and darkness of the grave for nearly two centuries and a half, was kindly sent for my inspection by Mrs. Constable Maxwell. It was of the most exquisite quality and colour, exactly resembling threads of burnished gold in its hue; it was very fine, and with an inclination to curl naturally.” The villagers of Winchcombe, near Cheltenham, aver to this day that Catherine Parr really lies buried in their quaint old church.

## SOMERSET AND HIS BROTHER.

THE Seymours plotted against each other. Thomas Seymour having secretly pointed out to the King the undue influence Somerset was using in every department of the State, aroused the Prince’s suspicions as to his uncle’s motives; but before his Highness could make further inquiry in the matter, Sir Thomas Seymour was betrayed by his agents. He was commanded to appear before the Council, where he repelled the

charges alleged against him with an air of haughty disdain and set the Council's authority at defiance<sup>9</sup>; but when the law officers of the Crown informed him that the real nature of his offence "approached to something like high treason," he expressed his regret, and pleaded ignorance of the law. He was then pardoned, and the fraternal rivals became apparently reconciled; and as a proof of his "good feeling towards his brother, Somerset added £800 a year to Seymour's appointments." It was evident Somerset feared the Admiral's private influence about the King, and the esteem in which he was held by the Princesses Mary and Elizabeth. Sir Thomas Seymour's indiscretion and ambition, however, soon placed him again in the power of his enemies. He now aspired to the hand of the Princess Elizabeth; the governess was bribed with a large sum of money; young Elizabeth's affections were said to have been won; but the matter was acknowledged to be surrounded "with serious difficulties." A clandestine marriage could have been easily accomplished; but according to the late King's will, such nuptials would invalidate the Princess's claims to the Crown. The plan then adopted by Seymour was to create a party amongst the discontented nobles, to extort from the Council and the King their consent to his marriage with Elizabeth<sup>1</sup>. But all his schemes were frustrated. The Protector was determined to crush his aspiring brother. Sherington, the Master of the Mint at Bristol, was examined before the Council on a charge of having amassed an enormous fortune by clipping the coin,

<sup>9</sup> Burnet, ii., sec. 15; Statutes of the Realm, iv. 62.

<sup>1</sup> Ellis, ii. 154. Tytler, i. 138. Lingard, vol. v. p. 273-4.

issuing testoons of inferior value<sup>2</sup>, and falsifying the entries made in his books. Sir Thomas Seymour, who was his creditor to the amount of £3,000, defended the accused; but Sherington, to save his own life, denounced his advocate and friend. He made a statement by way of confession that he had promised to coin a large sum of money for Seymour, who had ten thousand men ready to take the field, and that with their aid he would seize on the person of the King and overturn the Government which was so hateful to the country<sup>3</sup>. On this confession of Sherington Sir Thomas Seymour was committed to the Tower, and attainted of high treason. On several occasions he was brought before the Council for examination. He heard the “thirty charges” which were made against him with disdain; he claimed to be confronted with his accusers, but such an act of justice was contrary to the practice of the Government. A bill of attainder was hurried through the House of Lords. In the Commons it received some opposition, but the Protector soon overcame the scruples of that assembly. The bill was passed, and received the royal assent. In three days later the warrant for the execution of Sir Thomas Seymour was signed by Edward, Duke of Somerset, and Thomas, Archbishop of Canterbury. It has been alleged by the admirers of Somerset, that when the bill of attainder was passing through the Lords, he withdrew “for pity’s sake.” But there is no evidence that he did withdraw. From the journals of the Lords it is certain that the bill of attainder was read on three consecutive days—the 25th, 26th, and

<sup>2</sup> The testoon passed for twelve-pence, but was not intrinsically worth more than half that sum.

<sup>3</sup> Burley “State Papers.” Records in Burnett.

27th of February, and that the Duke of Somerset was present in his place on each of those days; that on the 27th the bill was passed with the assent of all the peers present<sup>4</sup>.

Latimer's conduct on this occasion was characteristic. He preached a sermon before the unnatural young King, denouncing his unfortunate uncle with the bitterest invective. He described the execution as "an act of justice; that Admiral Seymour led a sensual, dissolute, irreligious life; dangerously, irksomely, horribly." He contended that Sherington's conduct "should receive the approbation of all honest men. The fervency of Sherington's repentance entitled him to his pardon, and made him a fit example for the encouragement and imitation of sinners<sup>5</sup>." In another passage of Latimer's sermon he doubts whether Seymour's soul could be saved, as "God had clean forsaken him; that he was a wicked man, and the realm was well rid of him."

Let not young Edward be set down as ungrateful as a nephew, as Latimer was false as a friend. When Somerset kept the King without money, the wayward and generous Admiral was applied to, and Latimer was the "go-between." One letter, written on "a scrap of paper" by the young King, bore these words:—"My lord, send me, per Latimer, as much as ye think good, and deliver it to Fowler.—EDWARD<sup>6</sup>." Why we say that Edward may not have been ungrateful is, that he was beset with jealous watchers night and day, and was coerced into signing the warrant for his uncle's

<sup>4</sup> Lord's Journal, i. 346.

<sup>5</sup> Latimer's "Sermon on the bad Life of Sir Thomas Seymour;" Godwin, 93. Strype, i. 126.

<sup>6</sup> State Papers MSS. King Edward's Journal.

death, whilst Latimer, who was engaged in all the Admiral's intrigues—or treasons—went out of his way not only to commend his death, but to pronounce his damnation. If Latimer had had the good fortune to abandon the field of politics, he never would have earned his questionable reputation as a martyr.

Sir Thomas Seymour, if he renounced the religion of his fathers, had a distaste for the teaching of the new preachers<sup>7</sup>. He not only refused to attend his wife's "prayer meetings," but placed impediments in the way of her chaplains; and Parkhurst and Coverdale are described as "sorely put upon by the ridicule he cast upon them, asking them from whom they had received their mission to preach, to which they replied stoutly, 'from Jesus<sup>8</sup>.'" "This opposition," remarks Miss Strickland, "came with an ill grace from Seymour, who, for political purposes, professed to be a Reformer, and had shared largely in the plunder of the old Church; but in his heart he had no more liking for Protestant prayers and sermons than Queen Catherine's deceased lord, King Henry."<sup>9</sup> This character may fairly be applied to many of the chief notables of the period.

Sir Thomas Seymour was beheaded at the Tower Hill on the 20th of March, 1549<sup>9</sup>." He died with great apparent fortitude, but was "indifferent to religion." A tradition relates that he informed his page on the morning of the execution that he would find a letter concealed in the sole of his shoe to Lady Elizabeth, assuring her of the love he entertained for her High-

<sup>7</sup> Strype's "Memorials."

<sup>8</sup> Parkhurst's "Letter to Bullinger."

<sup>9</sup> Admiral Seymour's proper designation was that of "Lord Seymour of Sudbury."

ness to the last moment of his existence. It is, however, rather doubtful if any page was permitted to see him, for the prison usage at the Tower at that period was one of the most cruel isolation. Another version of this story states that on the scaffold Seymour informed a friend that he would find two letters between the soles of his slippers for the royal sisters, Mary and Elizabeth. It is further alleged that in those strangely concealed documents, he besought both sisters to avenge his death. If his "headlong career" is carefully considered, his Protestantism appears to be like that of most of his contemporaries—political. He was regretted by the populace of London and those parts of the country with which he was connected by family and property. When attached to the Court of Henry VIII., he was considered the handsomest, and was the most admired bachelor knight of England. He was gay, magnificent, and brave, excelling in all the manly exercises of the age, and much distinguished for the richness of his dress and ornaments. "It has never been explained," observes Miss Strickland, "how it happened that the grave, learned, and devout Catherine Parr should be the one to fix the wandering heart of this gay and reckless gallant, for whom the sprightliest beauties of the Court had sighed in vain. It is not, however, always possible to account for the inconsistencies of love."

To return to Catherine Parr. Many writers have passed extravagant eulogies upon the last wife of King Henry VIII.—much, perhaps, from the fact of her being the "second Protestant Queen of England." It is not of much moment, except to the interests of truth, to analyze probabilities; but, whether Reformer or otherwise,

Catherine Parr's memory should receive its deserts, and no more. The justice of Dr. Parkhurst's epitaph, describing her as

"The flower of her sex, renowned, great, and wise,"

will not be widely acquiesced in now, when the history of the times is so much better known. No one can well deny to Catherine Parr the credit of possessing the tact which so often conceals innate sentiment. Her Protestantism was probably sincere, but it sometimes appeared artificially intensified. In truth, with the perilous position of her life, she had to fashion her belief according to the caprice of a disappointed tyrant, swayed by every gust of passion, to this or that observance—the terrible Six Acts at one time directing her practice; at another, the wayward notions of her dangerous helpmate. She had no good opinion of the leading Reformers. To use her own words, "They wished to make a cat's-paw of her." She knew the motives of these men, and despised them as much as she hated Stephen Gardiner. Miss Strickland endorses the opinion expressed by so many that Gardiner had deadly designs on Catherine Parr. "The King," she says, "never forgave Gardiner the part he had taken in this affair, which proved no less a political blunder than a moral crime." Mr. Froude, writing at a later period, disposes of this charge against Gardiner to make away with Catherine Parr. "I look on that story," he observes, "not as exaggerated reality, but as pure unadulterated fable<sup>1</sup>." The learning of Catherine Parr has been much over-rated: she was a "clever adapter," and, as an eulogist of a century ago has had the can-

<sup>1</sup> Froude, vol. v. p. 318.

dour to aver, “the art to fashion the ideas of past or contemporary genius as her own”—an art which would now be regarded as akin to unfair appropriation, but was then almost necessary from the scarcity of learned men and erudite productions. She was much inferior in inherent talent and grasp of mind to her two step-daughters, Mary and Elizabeth, and failed, too, in a comparison with the benevolent qualities of her royal relatives. Her chastity has been unreproached; her love frigid and accommodating, an assumption to please or deceive her penultimate spouse. In wedding Henry she bowed to the inevitable will of a despot, and at his death nature was vindicated by her espousal of Thomas Seymour. Her romantic attachment for the Admiral is a strange history; and her marriage was regarded by her contemporaries as rather “unseasonable,” after being the widow of three husbands<sup>2</sup>. The “wisdom and piety” attributed to her were manifested in eluding the perils of her royal wifehood, and in escaping the slander of hostile critics. It may be said with impartial justice that Catherine Parr was a very good woman for her time, and preserved all the proprieties in a society filled with heartlessness, and at an epoch fraught with dishonour and duplicity.

<sup>2</sup> Leti states that exactly thirty-six days after Henry’s death a written contract of marriage and rings of “bethrowal” were exchanged between Catherine and Sir Thomas Seymour. According to King Edward’s Journal the marriage took place before his father was three months dead. About the time of the “bethrowal,” Catherine wrote a letter to the young King detailing her “grief for the loss of his father, and the unbounded love she entertained for him.” The letter contains many quotations from Scripture. This deception—for it was nothing else—ill-became a woman who had the reputation of candour, prudence, and extreme piety ascribed to her by so many writers.

## THE THREE CHANCELLORS.

THE conduct of Lord Chancellor Wriothesley cannot be excused. He acted in the spirit of other supposed Catholics, who professed zeal for a religion which they seldom practised. He disgraced Christianity by the cruelty with which he carried out the King's orders "for the torture of heretics." His conduct to Ann Askew<sup>3</sup>, a lady of great beauty and ancient lineage, who was supposed to be promoting Reformation principles, as the secret agent of Catherine Parr, was most revolting. This unhappy lady was ordered to be racked in the Tower, on which occasion it is alleged that the Chancellor (Southampton) was present, accompanied by Rich, the King's Advocate. The former expressed his disapproval of the "gentle manner" in which the official administered the torture, and then, it is stated, put his own hand to the rack, and "drew it so violently that he almost tore the body of the sufferer asunder. She was then condemned to be burnt alive, and being so dislocated by the rack she could not stand, and was conveyed to the stake "in a chair." The authorities cited for these horrible barbarities, are Foxe, Speed, and Baker. Foxe alleges that he transcribed the account from Ann Askew's own paper on the subject; but if she had been in the condition described, she could hardly have committed to paper an account of her sufferings. Speed, taking a contemporary as his authority, states that "King Henry himself had ordered

<sup>3</sup> In 1549 John Bale published a book in vindication of Ann Askew, entitled "The Elucidation of Lady Ann Askew's Martyrdom." In this work he charged Bishop Gardiner with being the cause of Ann Askew's death. The statement is entirely untrue.

Ann Askew to be stretched on the rack, being exasperated against her for having brought prohibited books into his palace, and imbued his queen and nieces (Suffolk's daughters) with her doctrines.” Singular to say, Burnet questions the accuracy of the special charge here made against Wriothesley; and Hume concurs in the doubt. Lingard likewise questions the statement as to his being present at the scene of torture, and contends that the rack was illegal at that period, although used, and was merely the instrument of the Sovereign and his ministers to discover what they considered plots. He gives no credit to any of the relations on this subject. “To me,” he observes, “neither story appears worthy of credit. For, 1. Torture was contrary to law, and therefore was never inflicted without a written order subscribed by the Lords of the Council. 2. The person who attended on such occasions to receive the confession of the sufferer was always some inferior officer appointed by the Council, and not the Lord Chancellor or other members of that body. 3. There is no instance of a female being stretched on the rack or subjected to any of those inflictions which come under the denomination of torture<sup>4</sup>. ”

Like Lord Cromwell, Chancellor Wriothesley attended executions at the stake for heresy, and it is asserted that the levity of his manner on those occasions was similar to that which characterised Cromwell and his officials. It would be difficult to either prove or disprove the extent of the cruelty exercised by the ministers of so whimsical a tyrant as Henry VIII. Wriothesley's conduct with respect to Queen Catherine Parr has been

<sup>4</sup> Lingard, vol. v. p. 201; also “Jardine on the Use of Torture.”

placed in the worst light ; but, like Gardiner, he has been misrepresented in this instance. The King, when it suited his purpose, threw the odium of his own misdeeds on his ministers. The plans laid for the destruction of Catherine Parr were actually concocted by Henry himself ; the state of his health, however, and some domestic matters interposed—not mercy. He would have his wife to believe that the Lord Chancellor and Bishop Gardiner were the persons who suggested her impeachment for heresy. Miss Strickland and other writers are inclined, with considerable justification, to believe that if Henry recovered his health, he would have despatched his sixth wife in perhaps a worse mode than that in which he had disposed of Catherine Howard. In his will there is an ominous sentence respecting a provision for the offspring of a *seventh* spouse ; and, besides being a “heretic,” Catherine had been barren to him as well as to her two previous husbands. That Gardiner and the Chancellor disliked Catherine Parr there can be no doubt, and they had every reason to be hostile to that intriguing lady ; but, as above stated, there is no proof that they conspired against her life. The persecution of the Reformers at this time has been attributed to the “suggestions of the King’s Papist advisers.” But judging from the correspondence between the monarch and his ministers on those matters, the “persecutors” were merely “carrying out the King’s instructions ;” they “carefully apprised his Highness every day of what steps they had taken against heretics ; and never ventured to rack, torture, or burn at the stake, except by the express orders of his Highness the King.” Let it also be recollected that most of the members of this very Council were Re-

formers in the next reign—perhaps were discreetly secret Protestants in that of Henry.

Chancellor Wriothesley received his share of the confiscated property, and some of it under discreditable circumstances ; but neither party seem to have had any scruples in plundering the “heritage of the poor<sup>5</sup>.” The intemperance and imprudence of the Chancellor at a subsequent period gave the Duke of Somerset and Archbishop Cranmer an opportunity of dismissing him from office ; but under any circumstances they were certain to quarrel with him, as he stood directly opposed to their secret policy. He was faithful to King Henry, faithful to the Tudor dynasty, and under no plea would he favour the Reformation. Such a man could hold no position in Somerset’s cabinet.

Wriothesley and Rich made themselves unpopular in the case of Catherine Howard by “suborning witnesses” and assisting Cranmer and the Seymours in their conspiracy against her. Lord Campbell has drawn a contrast between the demerits of Audley and Wriothesley. “Wriothesley,” he says, “displayed very different qualities from his predecessor (Audley) being a man of principle ; but he was, if possible, a worse minister, for when invested with power he proved narrow-minded, bigoted, and cruel. Fortunately he was likewise rash and headstrong, so that his objects were generally defeated and his political career was short.” That he persecuted the Reformers there can be no doubt, and they retaliated in the same spirit upon him. Wriothesley took the oath of supremacy to Henry, by

<sup>5</sup> The Cistercian Abbey of Bittlesden in Buckinghamshire, value 143*l.* yearly, now worth 284*l.*, was presented by Henry to Wriothesley ; also several valuable manors.

which he solemnly abjured the spiritual headship of the Pope ; yet, like many others, he took the oath through fear or avarice, perhaps imitating Cranmer in his mental reservation. His general conduct and character, however, present a marked contrast with that of his colleagues at the time of Henry's death. He could not agree with the Seymours, Dudley, Pembroke, Paget, Winchester, Cranmer, and Rich, who commenced the new reign with perjury and the violation of their solemn oaths to the dying monarch.

The particulars of Ann Askew's persecution and death seem even now to be imperfectly understood. Bishop Bonner was favourable if not friendly to her ; he did not wish to adjudicate upon her case. He considered her "brain somewhat affected by reading the Scriptures," and at another time it is stated that he told her jocularly to "go to the country and eat wild honey and rest her mind." It is alleged that Gardiner was the "person who panted most for Ann's blood out of hatred to the Queen." Gardiner never descended to this mode of assailing an enemy ; and it is highly probable that the "implacable feeling" that pursued Ann Askew to the death had its rise in the King's hatred to his wife and her Protestantism ; for, although Henry's secession from Rome, his plunder of the monasteries, and his oppression of the ancient Church, naturally led to another phase of observance, it was by no means Henry's wish or intention that a new religion should supersede the old. Therefore, the bitterness of bodily suffering in his last illness, coupled with remorse for the unintentional change his conduct had produced amongst his subjects, led him to rage in his latter days with greater fury against the professors of the new

belief. Sir George Blagge, a Nottinghamshire knight, whom Henry in his gross convivial moments styled his "fat pig," was the originator of many of the stories respecting Ann Askew and her fellow-sufferers. For instance, he stated that he himself would have been roasted alive if the "bloudie bishops had their way." There are several versions of the charges against Gardiner and Bonner at this juncture, but there is no official record to corroborate any one of them. Bonner was in Hertfordshire visiting his farm at the time of Ann's execution in Smithfield; whilst Gardiner was "laid up with the gout down at Winchester Palace." The interview between the King and Blagge, and his "miraculous escape from the stake," are also questionable relations. They were, however, subsequently coined into "historical facts" by Maister Foxe<sup>6</sup>, and later still by that gloomy Puritan, John Speed, and again by Gilbert Burnet. Sir George Blagge, however, was neither truthful nor honest; he was the friend of Coverdale, and a favourite with the gossiping ladies around Catherine Parr. In the mornings he attended King Henry at Mass, and when the sacrilegious King received Holy Communion he did likewise; a few hours subsequently he attended Catherine

<sup>6</sup> There is now every reason to believe that the various editions of Foxe have been changed from the original. For instance, in the Martyrologist's "Own Edition," he represents Ann Askew as describing the Lord Chancellor and Maister Rich "racking her themselves;" whilst in several later editions of the same author the name of *Gardiner* is substituted for that of *Rich* in this remarkable scene. The motive is obvious. Lingard (vol. v. p. 201), notices this dishonest substitution. It is not too much to say that false as Foxe's book was as he issued it, he would scarcely recognize as his own handiwork the extended and "corrected" edition now in vogue amongst the ignorant, and issued from the "Row" in tons of falsehood.

Parr's private "prayer meetings;" in the evening he was the companion of the Seymours at dice, wine, and debauchery; he cared little for any creed, but like many of his companions improved his fortune by adopting the principles of the Reformation, which he carefully abandoned whenever danger approached<sup>7</sup>. Historical statements based upon the evidence of such men as Blagge and the Seymours must be received with every caution, unless corroborated by other testimony.

Ann Askew or Kyme is described in the Council book (Harl. MSS.) as "very obstinate and heady in reasoning on matters of religion." She was tried before Archbishop Cranmer, as the chief judge of the Ecclesiastical Court, and the Archbishop condemned her to the flames. The accounts with respect to the scene in Smithfield at the immolation of Ann Askew are very contradictory. Wriothesley and Russell are described as being spectators, and behaving "with great levity of manner;" whilst others allege that they were not present. The whole transaction, whether with the King's express sanction, or the act of his ministers—who represented both the Papal and Anti-Papal party—covers all concerned with deserved infamy<sup>8</sup>.

Most writers upon this epoch of English history are notably silent upon the number of sentences for heresy, pronounced by Cranmer, and carried into execution by Cromwell in the reign of Henry. Cromwell at one time boasted that he had sixty-two thousand people in gaol, charged with various offences against the State—treason and heresy being the principal. The reader is

<sup>7</sup> John Hales' Sermon on the "Sins of Rich Men."

<sup>8</sup> See Ellis, iii. 117; Collier, ii. 212; Stowe, p. 592; State Papers, 868.

also aware that in the reign of Edward, Cranmer and Coverdale sat in council, and sentenced to the stake many Anabaptists, and others who dissented from the “newly-formed doctrines” of the Archbishop of Canterbury.

Here is a specimen of the cruelty of those times. A special statute was passed in Henry’s reign (Feb. 1530-1) declaring that deliberate poisoning should be “considered as great a crime as high treason.” But the penalty awarded was far more horrible—namely, “to be boiled alive in the presence of the populace;” and “without the benefit of clergy.” Richard Rouse, the Bishop of Rochester’s cook, who poisoned six persons, suffered under this barbarous law. “He roared mighty loud,” says an old chronicle, “and divers women who were big with child did feel sick at the sight of what they saw, and were carried away half dead; and other men and women did not seem frightened by the boiling alive, but would prefer to see the headsman at his work.”

In estimating the character of a man in those troublous times, it would be unjust to apply the estimate of modern notions. In that age toleration was in as little favour with the advocates of the Reformation as with the professing supporters of the Pope’s supremacy; and although we may condemn the extremes to which Wriothesley was driven by his fervid zeal, we cannot help respecting the sincerity and fidelity which distinguished him from the vast majority of King Henry’s courtiers and counsellors, as well as the chiefs of faction in the reign of Edward VI., who were ever ready to make faith, virtue, honour, all subservient to personal ambition, to power, and to avarice.

Sir Richard Rich, who succeeded Wriothesley as Chan-

cellor, also sustained persecutions in Henry and Edward's reigns. Like Dr. London, he had a natural bent for the strongest side, and "betrayed no weakness in supporting self" in the vital wrestle of interests which in his time occurred. He was the chief witness against his patron and generous friend, Sir Thomas More, on which occasion he was guilty of the characteristic crime of wilful and deliberate perjury. Even Foxe portrays Rich as "cruel and unprincipled." Acting as the King's advocate, he laid aside his robes to aid, as the reader is aware, in the torture of Anne Askew; at another time Piers Dutton charged him with purloining some of the golden chalices intended for the "royal cradle." Rich, of course, denied the accusation. Piers Dutton was an arrant liar, and so was Rich. This is the only truth that Henry found out: the gold was never elicited. When Rich was Chancellor to King Edward in 1551, he persecuted the Princess Mary for the practice of her religion, and for doing so received the rebuke of Cranmer. Amongst the death-warrants signed by Chancellor Rich in this reign was that of his personal friend, Thomas Seymour. Oldnixon describes the Chancellor as a man who was "neither Papist nor Protestant;" and again he avers his belief that he was "more Papist than Protestant."

"Maister Rich" was just the man to suit, in every respect, the members of the Protector Somerset's Cabinet. In early life Rich was "esteemed very light of his tongue, a great dicer and gamester, and not of any commendable fame."<sup>9</sup> In 1537 an insult was put on the House of Commons which shows most strikingly the degraded state to which Parliament was reduced in the reign of

<sup>9</sup> Speech of Sir T. More on his trial.

Henry VIII. On the recommendation of the Court, Maister Rich, who was hardly free from any vice except hypocrisy, was elected Speaker. While in that office he rendered effective service in “reconciling” the Commons to the suppression of the greater monasteries, and the grant of their possessions to the King. The monastic estates were put under the management of a royal commission, and Rich was placed at the head of it with the title of “Chancellor of the Court of Augmentations.” His first care, however, was to “augment” his own fortune, and he got a grant of the dissolved priory of Leighes, in Essex, and of other abbey lands of immense value, which were found to be a sufficient endowment for two earldoms enjoyed by his sons. He had been a spendthrift in his youth; but cupidity grew with wealth, and he became with advance of years penurious. In 1544 he was made Treasurer of the King’s Wars in France and Scotland—an office by virtue of which the whole of the expenditure for the pay and provisioning of the army passed through his hands, which afforded ample scope for his propensity to accumulate. Soon after the capture of Boulogne he was one of the commissioners who negotiated the peace between France and England. Maister Rich was now in high personal favour with King Henry, conforming himself to all his sovereign’s caprices, and assisting at the Council Board examining and punishing Lutherans for a violation of the Six Acts, and Catholics for refusing to acknowledge the King’s spiritual supremacy. When Henry’s will was made, Rich was appointed one of the sixteen executors who were to carry on the government during the minority of Edward. At this time both parties (of the old and new belief)

were suspicious of him, yet each expected his support—at least, so far as his professions could go. He had been included amongst the new peers created. Most of the commoners promoted by Somerset took new and high-sounding titles ; and it might have been expected that the man who had been a witness against Fisher and More would have become “Lord Leighes” (*lies*) ; but whether he was afraid that some unpleasant jests might have been passed upon this title, as personal rather than territorial, he preferred to enter the House of Lords as Baron Rich.

Such was Maister Rich in the reign of Henry VIII. Under Somerset’s Government he became Lord Chancellor, the legal duties of which position he discharged with considerable ability. At the suggestion of Cranmer he introduced a bill in the Lords to legalize the marriage of the clergy, to which he added a clause to the effect that priests would, nevertheless, do better to “remain true to their vows of celibacy.” This enactment was for some time most unpopular in the provinces, especially amongst the women, who averred that “they regarded a priest’s wife as a harlot.” Rich’s colleagues mistrusted and feared him. He acted with Somerset because it suited his interest, and with Cranmer signed the death warrant of his friend, the Lord Admiral. When Somerset’s fall was at hand, he acted with his usual systematic treachery. He would not judicially pronounce against him, but he gave Warwick the benefit of his legal opinion as to how the Protector was to be sent to the scaffold. He zealously promoted the measures in favour of the Reformation, yet his motives for doing so were wholly personal. He “feared,” says Lord Campbell, “a counter-revolu-

tion in religion, by which his share of the Church plunder might be wrested from him<sup>10</sup>.” The times becoming troublesome, and one faction destroying another, the Chancellor began to fear for the security of his own position. “Perceiving,” observes his biographer, “that, with an open and captivating manner, Lord Warwick (Northumberland) was dark, designing, immoderately ambitious, wholly unscrupulous, and remorseless, he could not speculate upon how soon his own turn might come to be committed to the Tower.” Lord Rich accordingly suddenly feigned a dangerous illness, and resigned his office of Chancellor. In a few weeks, however, he marvellously recovered his health, and retired to his estates in the country, where he lived for sixteen years longer. “He was,” writes Lord Campbell, “one of the most sordid as well as most unprincipled men that ever held the office of Lord Chancellor in England.” So entire was Rich’s seclusion that his existence was almost forgotten; and thus as he was rejoicing over the amount of his gains from the religious tempest which had swept the land, and enjoying the delights of his luxurious retreat, he was suddenly smitten with a mortal illness. When he ascertained that a prolongation of life was impossible, he eagerly besought those about him to bring to him a “Papal clergyman.” A messenger was despatched for an ecclesiastic; but before the arrival of the confessor, the soul of the ex-Chancellor was before its God<sup>1</sup>.

Thomas Godrich, Bishop of Ely, became the suc-

<sup>10</sup> Lord Campbell’s “Lives of the English Chancellors,” vol. ii. p. 11, 12.

<sup>1</sup> “The Death-bed of Chancellor Rich; A Discourse of John Hales, Preacher, ‘On the Wickedness of Wealthy People,’ 1565.”

cessor of Lord Rich. He was appointed by Northumberland (1551) while Somerset lay under sentence of death in the Tower. As the new Chancellor was utterly ignorant of the legal duties of the Chancery Court, Sir Thomas Beaumont, the Master of the Rolls, was "commanded" to hear and adjudicate upon all cases in Chancery. Godrich became—as was intended—a mere cypher in the Council, giving a legal effect to the secret policy of Northumberland and Cranmer. He, therefore, as Chancellor, signed every illegal and despotic decree which the Council proposed, and was a participator in the treason which intended to set aside the succession of the Tudor sisters. In this plot he felt reluctance to act, exclaiming, "It is wrong, it is wrong." But being a timid man, he feared Northumberland so much that he yielded. Upon the death of Edward VI. he appeared at Sion House to salute Jane Grey as Queen of England. On the following day, as Chancellor, he signed a document—to which Cranmer's name was also affixed—addressed to the Lady Mary, "commanding her to abandon her false claims to the Crown, and to submit to her lawful and undoubted sovereign, Queen Jane." But a few days later the affrighted Chancellor abandoned Jane Grey's party, and surrendered the Great Seals to Lords Arundel and Paget to present to Queen Mary, "humbly imploring mercy for his treason." "He was," writes Lord Campbell, "beset with great terrors from the part he had taken in concocting the patent to change the succession; but partly from his clerical office, or from his real insignificance, he was not molested in his diocese." His former zeal for the promotion of the Reformation had now almost disappeared, and he offered no opposi-

tion to the restoration of the olden religion. Indeed, he seems to have possessed the accommodating manners of Dr. Kitchen and of Wotton. He did not long, however, survive the change ; he died in May, 1554. "In the lottery of life," says Lord Campbell, "some high prizes are appropriated to mediocrity, and Thomas Godrich was the holder of a fortunate ticket."

Chancellor Godrich was a man of obscure origin and small acquirements. He had been a scholar of Cambridge, and was amongst some of the first in that university who spoke in favour of the Reformation, but cautiously avoided making any public avowal of his opinions until after King Henry's death. He was employed by Cranmer to assist Poynet and himself in the "revision of the Prayer Book," and was rewarded for his labours by the Bishopric of Ely. In Queen Mary's reign he was "merely tolerated," and before his death he returned to the olden creed of England. When in power, and the colleague of cruel men, he was, it is but just to say, always opposed to persecution, and his Protestantism differed much from that of his party. Little is known of his private life but that he was very kind to his relatives, and made ample provision for two illegitimate daughters, who subsequently took the veil in Madrid<sup>2</sup>.

The Chancellors who held office under Edward VI. in many instances acted on their own responsibility, without either statute law or precedent to guide them. In 1549 Lord Rich, as Chancellor, issued a proclamation under the Great Seal, addressed to "all justices of the peace, commanding them in the King's name to arrest all coiners and setters abroad of vain and forged

<sup>2</sup> Pomeroy's Letters to Laseilles on Chancellor Godrich.

tales and lies, and to commit them to the galleys, there to row in chains during the King's pleasure<sup>3</sup>." Proclamations were issued fixing a certain price for the sale of provisions, quality, &c.; also with respect to base coinage, entailing heavy penalties on the evildoers. The latter proclamations were among Rich and Godrich's best actions. How far they were obeyed is rather doubtful. With respect to the uses made of the Great Seal in political matters, there seems to have been a total disregard of either equity or law, or that sense of honour which once characterised English Chancellors. In the hands of such a judge as Sir Thomas More, this dangerous mode of procedure might perhaps be used for the good of the community at large; but it was an irresponsible exercise of power which a country possessing the forms at least of a representative government should not permit.

## THE FALL OF SOMERSET.

THE Protector possessed little control over his military agents. Kingston and Russell, as the reader is aware, perpetrated many barbarous deeds in Somersetshire and the western counties. The number slain by Lord Russell in Devonshire amounted to five thousand; and in Norfolk, Lord Warwick boasted that he had "killed four thousand of the enemy<sup>4</sup>." Kingston distinguished himself by the sanguinary promptitude of his action, and the brutal levity of his manner. Here is an example of his general conduct. Having dined with the mayor of Bodmin, he asked him if the gallows in

<sup>3</sup> Strype, Dyer; also Campbell's "Chancellors."

<sup>4</sup> " King Edward's Journal," Foxe, vol. iii.; Holinshed, p. 1002; Hayward, p. 295; Strype, vol. ii. p. 170.

that town was sufficiently strong. The mayor replied that he thought so. "Then," said Kingston, "go out and try." The mayor was hanged within an hour! On another occasion, having received information against a miller, he proceeded to the mill, and not finding the master, he hanged his servant, bidding him "be content, for it was the best service he had ever rendered to his master<sup>5</sup>."

The writers who chronicle these transactions are not "Papists of any shade," but uncompromising advocates of the Reformers; nevertheless, they felt compelled to place before the world the wicked actions of Somerset's agents. The deeds of Kingston and Russell hastened the fall of the Protector; but his own two visits to Scotland were marked with rapine and slaughter even more extensive than those which have rendered infamous the memories of Kingston and Russell.

Somerset never enjoyed any real popularity. He is said to have been "beloved by the merchants and traders of London," yet these bodies were the first to approve of Warwick's impeachment of him. The Common Council of London being applied to by Lord Warwick for their support, with one voice declared their approbation of the new measures against the Duke, and their resolution of supporting them<sup>6</sup>. Chancellor Rich and Lord Russell, who perpetrated so many infamous deeds at the Protector's order, had abandoned him, and the populace, on whom he so much depended, "did not rise at his summons." The great mass of the country adhered to the principles of their fathers; and looking at Somerset as one of the chief organizers of the new

<sup>5</sup> Speed, p. 113; Hayward, p. 295.

<sup>6</sup> Stowe, p. 597.

order of things, they rejoiced at his overthrow. The large estates which he had suddenly acquired at the expense of the Church and the Crown rendered him likewise an object of envy. The palace which he was building in the Strand served, by its magnificence, and still more by the circumstances which attended it, to expose him to public indignation ; but he despised popular opinion when he thought he had become the permanent Regent. He had learned to disregard the “rights of property.” He pulled down three bishops’ houses and the Church of St. Mary, to furnish ground and materials for his new palace. He ordered St. Margaret’s Church, Westminster, to be also demolished, to obtain building materials ; but the parishioners indignantly resisted, and would not permit such an act of robbery and sacrilege ; they rose up to defend their church, and compelled the Protector’s masons to retire. He next laid hands on a chapel in St. Paul’s Church-yard, with a cloister and charnel-house belonging to it, and these edifices, together with a church of St. John of Jerusalem, were made use of to erect his palace in the Strand. What rendered the matter more odious to the populace was, that the tombs and other monuments of the dead were defaced and desecrated, bodies and bones were exposed to public view, and “then carted away to some filthy ditches, or fields beyond the citie<sup>7</sup>.”

When the conspiracy formed by the Earl of Warwick and his party in the Council against the Protector became sufficiently matured, Archbishop Cranmer and Sir William Paget openly joined in Warwick’s impeachment of Somerset. The confinement of Somerset in the

<sup>7</sup> Heylin, p. 72 ; Holinshed ; Hayward ; Hume, vol. iii. (fol. edit.), p. 328.

Tower caused the most gloomy apprehensions to the Reformers, whilst the Papal party could discover no difference in the oppression exercised towards them by the contending factions. The articles preferred against Somerset might be divided into three classes, charging him with obstinacy, incapacity, and bad faith, during the insurrection in Devonshire.

Somerset made a statement, “on his knees,” before the Council, that all the charges preferred against him were true, and implored their mercy. He was deprived of his offices, and fined to the amount of 2000*l.* per year, to be “ deducted from his newly-acquired estates.” The prosecution was carried no further, but to the astonishment of Lord Warwick the King would not consent to this heavy fine on his uncle. Somerset was again admitted to the Council, but Warwick had now gained almost despotic power, controlling every department of government. Somerset’s ambition and imprudence soon placed him in the power of his enemies again. Fresh indictments were entered against him, in which he was charged with both felony and treason. Before a second trial took place, his former friend, the Marquis of Winchester, was created lord high steward. Twenty-seven peers were summoned to attend the trial, among whom were the newly self-created Duke of Northumberland, and Lords Northampton and Pembroke. These were well known to be the implacable enemies of Somerset. The depositions against the accused are not in existence, but they are supposed to have been of the same character as those he himself had so often made in the case of his own victims. He was acquitted of treason but found guilty of felony. The Marquis of Winchester passed sentence of death upon

him. A humiliating scene followed. The proud tyrant of yesterday became an abject suppliant. He fell upon his knees before Lords Northampton, Northumberland, and Pembroke; but they were deaf to his entreaties, and the hapless prisoner was “ordered back to the Tower to prepare for death.” Immured in his cell, after condemnation, Somerset must have pondered in bitter reflection on the fate of his brother, Thomas Seymour, who, but three years before, lay in the same dungeon, consigned to the same fate. Vainly did that brother plead to him for mercy, and equally fruitless were the supplications of others. Could he hope from Warwick, his deadly foe, unbound by kith and kinship, for that mercy which he had refused his own brother? Yet he essayed it with the same result. He wrote to Elizabeth to mediate for him with her brother, but the Princess, even if she had the opportunity, could scarcely have the will, to intercede for the legal assassin of Thomas Seymour, for whom he had often accused her of having indulged a criminal affection. The death of Surrey, sacrificed to the Seymour party, was also recalled against the last chances of the Protector. He and his younger brother Henry, baulked in their hopes of the Howard property by the astute providence of Norfolk in bestowing it upon the King, displayed their rapacity by dividing and wearing the caps and vestures, shirts and stockings, of their gifted and gallant victim<sup>8</sup>. The “new nobles,” as Surrey called them, “overreached the headsman, and deprived him of his vails.” And now came the last phase of a signal retribution.

All approaches to the King were closed, nay, Edward was convinced of his uncle’s guilt, and the only answer

<sup>8</sup> Lingard, vol. v.; Turner, vol. x., xi.; Queens of England, vol. v.

the doomed noble received was, “that the executioner should do his office, but that he should have a long respite to prepare for death.” Six weeks afterwards the warrant was signed, and at eight in the morning of January 22nd, 1552, the Protector Somerset ascended the scaffold on Tower Hill. An immense crowd of the lower classes witnessed the execution. A respite had been nearly to the last moment expected, but none came, although the incident of Sir Anthony Brown, a member of the Council, riding through the Tower portal to the scaffold, gave rise to a cry of “pardon,” and interrupted Somerset in his address to the spectators. But the victim was quickly undeceived, and resumed his dying discourse, averring his loyalty to the King, exhorting his auditors to love their sovereign, obey his counsellors, and desiring their prayers that he might die as he had lived in the “faith of Christ.” Then, covering his face with a handkerchief, he laid his head on the block, and at one blow the head of the once puissant Protector rolled in the dust. Somerset, no matter what his crimes, his wiles, his hypocrisies, was the only one of the chief and primary Reformers who died consistently. He said in his last address, that on reviewing his past conduct “there was nothing which he regretted less than his endeavours to reduce religion to its present state;” and he exhorted the people to profess and practise the Reformation principles if they wished to escape the visitations of Heaven.” Such was the closing scene in the brief career of the great lay Reformer, Edward Seymour, Duke of Somerset. Dean Hook, who for obvious reasons would present him to posterity as a disinterested, unblemished statesman, is impelled to admit, that “he has received a

character for excellence which he does not deserve ; and that the fact of his being a Calvinist accounts for the enthusiasm with which his history has been written by some authors."

A question arises, what course Somerset would have adopted if he lived and was in power at the period of the young King's death. Would he have set aside Henry's daughters, or raised Jane Grey to the throne ? He had a personal dislike to Elizabeth, his hostility to Mary was on "religious" grounds alone. Such an incident would have given us a better insight into his character.

Of the many persons charged with being accomplices of Somerset only four were executed—namely, Vane, Stanhope, Partridge, and Arundel. They all protested their innocence, and Vane in strong language assured the spectators on Tower Hill, that "as often as Lord Warwick should lay his head on his pillow, he would find it wet with their innocent blood<sup>9</sup>." Here the Reformers sent their own associates and friends to the scaffold on the testimony of suborned witnesses.

The widow of the Protector was a notable character amongst the "Women of the Reformation." She was one of the prisoners liberated by Queen Mary on her visit to the Tower after her accession. Her marriage to an obscure person named Joshua Newdigate, may, says Miss Aikin, prove that either ambition was not the only inordinate affection to which the disposition of the Duchess was subject, or that she was now reduced to seek safety in insignificance. There is still extant a

<sup>9</sup> Council Book, fol. 259 ; Stowe, 607 ; Edward's Journal, p. 56 ; Burnett, Strype, Turner, Lingard.

large inventory of her jewels and valuables, among which are enumerated “two pieces of unicorn’s horn,” an article highly valued in that day, from its supposed efficacy as an antidote, or a test, for poisons. The extreme scantiness of her bequests for charitable purposes was justly remarked as a strong indication of a harsh and unfeeling disposition, in an age when similar benefactions formed almost the sole resource of the sick and needy.

Heylin draws an unfavourable character of the Duchess, whom he describes as “coarse and detracting.” In speaking of Catherine Parr, she rudely remarked: “Did not Henry VIII. marry her in his doting days, when he had brought himself so low by his lust and cruelty that no lady that stood on her honour would venture near him. And shall I now give place to her who in her former estate was but Latimer’s widow, and is now fain to cast herself for support on a younger brother? If Maister Admiral (Lord Thomas Seymour) teach his wife no better manners, *I am she that will.*” Hayward pronounces the Duchess “a woman for many imperfections intolerable, but for pride monstrous. She was both exceeding violent and subtle in accomplishing her ends, for which she spurned all respect for conscience and shame. This woman did bear such invincible hate to the Queen Dowager, first for light cause and woman’s quarrels, and especially because she (Queen Catherine) had precedence over her, being the wife of the greatest peer in the land.” It is curious to find that the “wife of the Protector Somerset” enjoyed the friendship of Queen Mary for many years. Mary describes her as “My good Nann,” and “My good gossip.” On the 24th of April, 1547,

when the Duchess was a “woman of powerful influence,” the Princess Mary wrote to her to intercede “for two poor servants who were formerly attached to the household of her mother, and who were then in poverty.” “My good Nann,” writes Mary, “I again trouble you both with myself and all mine. Thanking you with all my heart for your earnest gentleness towards me and my suits hitherto, reckoning myself out of the continuance of the same.” The Duchess of Somerset died in 1587, at a very advanced age, having outlived nearly all her notable contemporaries.

## CLERICAL REFORMERS.

THE English popular estimate of Cranmer, Poynet, and Coverdale places them on an equality with the Apostles and the martyrs of the Primitive Church. But this is the age of inquiry. A distinguished Anglican clergyman takes exception to such “popular opinion,” declaring that “the real character of those men can be no longer concealed, even though it may cast reflections upon the Reformation. These Reformers,” observes Dr. Littledale, “who are cited as authorities and as examples, were men of the basest and lowest stamp. They committed or encouraged the vilest crimes; they were corrupt, perjured, dishonest, cowardly, and irreligious. They violated every pledge and every duty which bound them to man, and it is consequently most improbable, to say the least of it, that they can be safe guides in matters relating to God.” Dean Swift once expressed the wish that when the Pope cleared his garden he would not throw the weeds over the walls of the Established Church; but the process seemed to

have existed more or less from the beginning. When the violation of vows and repudiation of oaths rendered a continuance in the Church of Rome impossible, the defaulting bishops or priests turned to the formation of a Church possessing a convenient laxity of discipline, where they were able, to use the words of John Bale, to "enjoy life, belly cheer, and other comforts denied by the Papacy."

JOHN POYNET's contemporaries describe him as a most eminent scholar of King's College, Cambridge. His mechanical skill first made him known to Henry VIII., to whom he presented a clock full of "wonderful curiosities." He became a royal chaplain, and was favoured by the patronage of Archbishop Cranmer. Like his patron, he formed an attachment for a barmaid, who died of the plague. He conducted himself in Henry's reign with apparent propriety; preached before the King, and denounced heretics, whilst at the same time he had violated all the leading principles of Catholicity. Upon the accession of Edward VI. he publicly proclaimed his adhesion to the Reformation<sup>1</sup>. When Dr. Gardiner was sent to the Tower by Somerset, Poynet was "intruded," to use the current phrase, into the diocese of Winchester. He was translated from Rochester, but all the surroundings of that preferment seemed more or less opposed to canon and statute law. He got possession, however, of a portion of the revenues of the see, and held them, *per fas et nefas*, until the end of Edward's reign. His extreme Genevese principles, and the grossness of his manners and language, rendered him peculiarly obnoxious to the Princess Elizabeth, who on her accession gave him no encou-

<sup>1</sup> Godwin, Collier, and Dodd.

ragement to return to England. Stowe tells us Poynet was concerned in Wyatt's rebellion, in Mary's reign, but on the day on which his chief was taken, Poynet abandoned the cause and fled to Germany, leaving with Wyatt the comfortless promise of his "prayers for better fortune." Maitland describes Poynet's exile as "not that of a persecuted heretic, but as a runaway traitor." As to his private life, Nicholas Sanders has been accused of slander by many writers for charging Poynet with having, bishop as he was, felt so unsatisfied with one wife that he carried off the spouse of a butcher, "who, by the laws of the land, was restored to her lawful husband." It is probable that Sanders made a mistake here, for three months after Poynet was condemned at St. Paul's to pay a fine in annual instalments to the butcher for having taken away his wife, he married Maria Seymond at Croydon, at which marriage Cranmer was present. He had married, it seems, the butcher's wife, from whom he was divorced at St. Paul's, and then amerced in fine, as above stated. Two contemporary documents, disinterred by the Camden Society, the "Chronicle of the Grey Friars," and the "Diary of John Machyn," a London citizen who followed the trade of undertaker, prove on independent testimony this event in Poynet's life, and confirms Sanders in all except that Poynet was "wived" when he unwived the butcher. Under the year 1551 (Edward VI.'s time), we have the following in Machyn's Diary (p. 8), whose words are modernized for the general reader:—"The 27th day of July the new Bishop of Winchester *was divorced from the butcher's wife with shame enough.*" In the "Grey Friars' Chronicle," the record of Poynet's divorce is set down

as follows:—"And the 27th of the same month the Bishop of Winchester that was then was divorced from his wife in Paul's, the which was a butcher's wife of Nottingham, and gave her husband a certain money a year during his life, as it was judged by the law." If a cause is to be judged by its promoters, the reputation of the religious change of England owes little to Poynet. The holier a cause the more virtuous should be the instruments employed in its service seems to the unsophisticated a palpable truth, yet the dictum has been sadly challenged by experience at every side. The Reformed religion owed much of its constitution and digestion to this episcopal Paris. He had a marked share in drawing up the original of the *present* "Thirty-nine Articles of Religion," but it cannot be proved that the clause in the forty-two articles, first drawn up, declaring that bishops, priests, and deacons "are not commanded of God's law to vow the estate of single life," was supplied by Poynet, though it has been attributed to his pen. But would it be too harsh to say that if his doctrine were to be interpreted by his practice it ought to have contained a proviso for the immunity of bishops who should be convicted of committing adultery<sup>2</sup>? It was with evident reluctance that Heylin ever wrote a line derogatory to the reputation of a Reformer, especially one regarded as a leader. Still he felt compelled to write thus of Poynet, briefly yet significantly:—"John Poynet, a better scholar than a bishop, was purposely preferred to the rich bishopric of Winchester to serve other men's purposes." The

<sup>2</sup> In the histories of the English dioceses the reader will perceive the marked contrasts between the social good accomplished by the bishops of the "unreformed" and "reformed" creeds.

history and traditions of Winchester are also unfavourable to the memory of Poynet<sup>3</sup>. Yet, sooth to say, the moral and spiritual reputation of Poynet was as fair as that of most of his contemporary episcopal brethren.

Dean Hook makes the following observations upon the appointment of Poynet on the extrusion of Gardiner. When we remember that Cranmer at the time was *de facto* regent of the kingdom, the freedom from meddling in the matter ascribed to him can be readily ascertained. The learned Dean writes:—"Let us hope, and we may believe, that with this act of gross injustice Cranmer was not concerned. He did not shrink from recourse to measures which would render Gardiner impotent to oppose the Reformation ; but the object of the Council in seizing his bishopric was to divide the spoils among themselves. They appointed Poynet to be the successor of Gardiner, and this was a transaction which brings disgrace upon the Reformation, not more for the deed itself, than for the manner in which the partizans of Protestantism have defended it. Poynet was a very learned man, an eloquent and powerful advocate of ultra-Protestantism, though ready to yield when it was his interest to do so. At one time he must have been a consummate hypocrite, for we cannot otherwise account for his having been made chaplain to a man *so good, earnest, and upright as* Archbishop Cranmer. *He was an immoral and bad man, who was at last so lost to all sense of shame that he lived in open adultery with a butcher's wife,* and was compelled legally to separate by the ecclesiastical courts, and to pay an annuity to the woman's husband. The extent of his

<sup>3</sup> See "History of the Diocese of Winchester ;" Camden Society's Papers.

profligacy was only known to an interested few when he was appointed to the see of Winchester, until which time he had played the hypocrite's part. That he was, however, an unprincipled man the Council must have known, for he agreed to reserve two thousand marks for himself, and divided the rest of the temporalities among those greedy courtiers whose zeal for the Reformation was of the same character as his own. Such was the man appointed to succeed Gardiner, who, with all his faults—and they were many—was a stern man, of strict morality, and a man of learning in the law, though not in divinity, and a gentleman<sup>4</sup>.” Of Poynet's career in Germany little is known beyond the fact that he “took to black beer and dice.” He died at Strasbourg in 1556, poor and friendless, in the 41st year of his age.

MILES COVERDALE, the “man of the Bible,” was an Augustinian Friar, who came to dislike celibacy and to relish the good living forbidden by the vows of his order. Lord Cromwell was one of his early patrons, to whom he suggested “many plans” for the projected confiscation of Church property. He was connected with and aided in carrying out Somerset's schemes in Edward's reign. He acted as a kind of “military chaplain” to Lord Russell and Anthony Kingston during the massacres of the Devonshire people, who merely took up arms in defence of their rights of conscience—in defence of the religion which their fathers had practised for a thousand years. This part of Coverdale's history will not bear much investigation. Many years before the Six Acts were nullified by general infringement, Coverdale took to wife a comely young woman

<sup>4</sup> Hook's *Cranmer*, vol. vi. p. 244—5.

who was well known to have more power over him than his vows to God, or his afterwards shifting principles. It has been stated that Coverdale never married, but Hales, the preacher, describes his wife as “young, pretty, and pious, and ardent in searching the Scriptures.” He assisted at the consecration of Parker as the “first Protestant Archbishop of Canterbury,” but never received any episcopal appointment from Elizabeth. He had been, in reward, we suppose, for his services in the Devonshire campaign, made Bishop of Exeter, but upon the accession of Mary he retired to Denmark, where he adopted the extreme Lutheran doctrines propounded by the King of that State. He was very accommodating to Elizabeth and her ministers, but nevertheless was disliked. Like Calvin, he was in nowise so gloomy in action as in writing. Cranmer’s widow knew Coverdale, and reported the result of her honest personal observation when she said of him, “Maister Coverdale is too fond of women and wine to be a fit man to reform religion.” Probably the Archbishop’s widow became better acquainted with Coverdale as he had business relations with her second husband, the printer. Catherine Parr, to whom Coverdale was chaplain and almoner up to the period of her death, has recorded a favourable opinion of him when she states that “good Maister Coverdale was moral and temperate, but inclined to persecute those who still adhered to Popery.” She had, however, been deceived by him in many respects—for instance, Catherine had a particular aversion to married priests, and discharged a chaplain at one time whom she discovered to be a married man. She could not, therefore, have been aware of the fact that Dr. Coverdale had a “pretty young wife” at the

very time he was her chaplain and almoner. In a letter of Poynet's, he describes Coverdale's wife as "young, frisky, and pleasant." Coverdale's Bible, the joint translation into English by himself and Tyndale, was for sale at the price of 10s. (about 3*l.* of our present money), but was so confused and full of errors that the few who had sufficient learning preferred the Latin version. George Jaye also assisted Coverdale in rendering the Bible. For the worth and veracity of this man, see Maitland's "Essays on the Reformation," p. 4 to 12. Anthony Delabarre and Thomas Green were of the same school as Jaye, and have obtained niches in Mr. Froude's gallery of the heroes of the English Reformation. However, a history of the transactions connected with Bishop Coverdale's career as "politician, citizen, and prelate," would not be an edifying record. As time wore on he began to dislike his second wife, and she, like the helpmates of other Reformed prelates, was not happy. Perhaps the disparity of years and temperament made him an uncongenial companion for a young woman, although a Puritan. He also took a general dislike to women. He became haughty and uncommunicative to the "world without." He was no admirer of the men of the "new learning," although he seemed zealous in forwarding their views; and when some Reformers spoke of the Holy Eucharist as "Jack in the Box," it is said he denounced their blasphemy in the strongest language<sup>5</sup>. Nevertheless he persecuted, whenever it

<sup>5</sup> In Coverdale's Preface to his translation of Calvin's treatise on the "Eucharist," the reader will find this "rebuke," if such it be. In the Parker Society Papers are also to be found some extracts from Coverdale's writings; to which few modern Protestants will attach much importance.

was in his power, the members of the Augustine order ; but when his mind, softened by the memories of youth, recurred to its early associations, there were times in which he spoke of the inhabitants of the cloister in the language of charity and love, exclaiming, "The happiest hours I ever spent were in the Priory at Cambridge." His latter days became gloomy and unhappy. The cowl, the cross, and the cloak of the once austere Augustine Confessor haunted him by day and by night ; he wandered at evening time for hours in his garden, admitting none to disturb the solitude of his meditations. He seemed like a distinguished contemporary, "disappointed in worldly prospects and uneasy in conscience ;" but he made no outward manifestation of feeling, unless his remark on the falling of the October leaves, and the mournful cadence of the night wind, be so regarded. "These little incidents," he says, "put me in mind of another world, and I tremble." Miles Coverdale died at the age of eighty-one, and was buried in St. Bartholomew's Church. His evangelical admirers made a search for his remains in 1840. The coffin was discovered, and his bones were "reverently transferred" to the Church of St. Margaret, London-bridge, where they at present repose.

JOHN HOOPER, after graduating at Oxford in 1518, became a Cistercian monk at Gloucester, taking, of course, the vow of perpetual celibacy. He soon left Gloucester, and returned to Oxford, which he was obliged to leave because of his heterodox opinions. When the Bill of the Six Articles passed, he went abroad, joined Bullinger, and there broke his vow, and married a lady of Burgundy, whom Foxe describes as "a great comforter of the bishop in his labours." On his return to England

he joined the Duke of Somerset's household, and commenced preaching in the public places, where his levelling sentiments made him a favourite with the friends of a new religion which seemed democratic. He was accused by the men of the "old learning" as being "scurrilous, profane, and immoral in the pulpit." His apologists deny these charges, but his accusers prove at least the charge of scurrility, for even Peter Martyr, an extreme Protestant, warned him to be more guarded and less censorious in his language, and Edward VIth's council had to silence him for his fanatical denunciations<sup>6</sup>. He took an active part in the proceedings which attended the deprivation of Bonner. When named for the See of Gloucester, he raised strong objections to the use of the episcopal vestments. Ridley, Bucer, and Peter Martyr argued with him in their favour, but in vain. He held out steadily that the rochet and chimere were "inventions of Antichrist," and that to wear them was absolute sin. If he had been convinced by the arguments, or if he had refused a bishopric clogged with the usual conditions, he might be entitled to respect, but he accepted the See, and wore the vestments, while declaring them "to be wicked and devilish," and kept up a life-long quarrel with Ridley, who was credited with having had the best of the dispute. "It is not easy," says Dr. Littledale, "to stigmatize such conduct too forcibly. If we desired a modern parallel, we should be obliged to invent some wild and improbable hypothesis. Suppose, for example, that an illiterate and virulent Puritan of our day were to set himself against daily services, especially choral ones, and to write a book to prove that Gothic church architecture was an

<sup>6</sup> Collier, Strype's Memorials, and Burnet.

invention of the devil to ruin souls, and then, without any previous change of views, were to clutch greedily at the Deanery of a Gothic cathedral, would not every one, even of his own school, call him a hypocrite?" "He degraded the episcopal office by following Cranmer's lead, and consenting to hold his spiritual dignity solely at the King's pleasure. And as his open hostility to all the distinctive tenets and usages of the Church deprives him of the sympathy of Anglicans, so this base subserviency to the brute force of the State repels all devout Nonconformists also. He had been one of the loudest inveighers against pluralism, and had urged its existence as a main ground for a sweeping reformation. His own first step was to accept the See of Worcester to be held along with that of Gloucester. He conveyed away the property of his See, of which, of course, he was a mere trustee for life-interest, to the rapacious courtiers to whom he owed his promotion. The See of Worcester, by-the-bye, was Latimer's, and it is supposed that he was less pliable in this matter, and therefore was not reinstated when Heath was set aside by Somerset. Of two charges, however, Hooper is to be acquitted. He was no coward, and he was no traitor to Queen Mary, as he steadily refused to join in Cranmer's plot."

We preferred adopting the foregoing estimate of Bishop Hooper from a Protestant pen, both because we might be accused of prejudice for using language of such severity, and because Dr. Littledale has spent many years in searching out facts of which he has given so stern and truthful an exposition.

Dean Hook describes Hooper as "pious and obstinate," "as ready to be burnt as he was to burn." And

again, “He was doubtless employed as the spy or public prosecutor in the case of Bonner.” The violence of Hooper’s language to an ignorant and fanatical rabble had often an evil effect. But the conduct of Peter Martyr was far worse. In Oxfordshire the “rope and the gibbet” were introduced to give effect to his arguments, and his personal malice produced the saddest results—presenting the bodies of many zealous and aged priests dangling from the towers of their own churches<sup>7</sup>. Hooper’s case was however far different. The fact of sending him to the stake convicts the council, and not the Queen, of shameful cruelty. Unlike many of the leading Reformers, Hooper was as loyal to his legitimate Sovereign as he was faithful to his own newly-formed opinions on religion, which were certainly puritanical and extreme. In a narrative which he wrote of his conduct, he observes with simple truth:—“When Queen Mary’s fortunes were at the worst I rode myself from place to place (as is well known) to win and stay the people for her party. And whereas when another (Lady Jane Grey) was proclaimed, I preferred our Queen, notwithstanding the proclamations. I sent horses in both shires (Gloucester and Worcester), to serve her in great danger, as Sir John Talbot and William Lygon can testify<sup>8</sup>. ” The execution of Hooper was perhaps one of the most revolting scenes that occurred at the “stake” in those days. The conduct of Lord Chandos, Sir Anthony Kingston, and the sheriffs, was indescribably infamous. These men were

<sup>7</sup> Froude’s History of England, vol. v., p. 186.

<sup>8</sup> Hooper was very charitable; every day he gave a substantial dinner to a number of destitute people, and “dismissed each with some words of comfort.”

under no bigoted influence, but had the baseness to adapt their principles and conduct to suit every party which gained ascendancy. They were Protestants in the previous reign—professing Catholics in this. And that such cruel ungrateful crimes as the execution of Hooper did not meet with the assent of genuine Catholics there is no question. Many of the ancient Catholic families of England protested against these persecutions; and the Lord Abbot Feckenham wrote a “Warning Voice” on the subject to Bishop Bonner. The great body of the nation was innocent of sectarian persecution; Englishmen were incapable of such a crime; indeed they were too kindly in their nature to persecute. But in those evil days political ambition or personal revenge achieved a fatal triumph not only over the better sentiments of humanity, but subdued that moral consciousness which Providence has imparted to man to advance his virtue whilst ennobling his nature. A Benedictine named Alfred Tyrrell had likewise the courage to write an admonition to Bishop Bonner, telling him that the “burning of Hooper was an awful outrage against the doctrines of the Catholic Church, which were kindness and charity to all who differed from its principles.” Henry Griffin, who held the office of secretary to his relative, the Bishop of Rochester, in a quaint letter defends Bonner’s conduct in Hooper’s case, stating that he was “pushed forward by the personal enemies of that prelate, amongst whom was the Marquis of Winchester, whose flagrant immoralities and scandals Bishop Hooper had often denounced.” This is but a poor excuse for Bonner, who, if he had been swayed by the charity of Christianity, instead of greedily adopting the influences of worldly ambition, would have abandoned

his Star Chamber injustice, and as an eminent prelate has written, would “have taken up his crozier and repaired to some distant forest scene, where he might mourn over the distractions of his country, and pray for the restoration of peace to the troubled spirits of the once happy and virtuous people of England.” Hooper’s sufferings at the stake were horrible. The whole affair covers those concerned with well-deserved infamy.

ROBERT FERRAR, Bishop of St. David’s, who never attained the same rank in popular estimation as the four other prelates who were burnt in Mary’s reign, was comparatively innocent of malpractices. It seems, like Hooper, he broke the vow which he had taken as an Austin canon, and married in despite of it. He made himself so exceedingly unpopular in his diocese, especially to the Cathedral Chapter, that in 1551 he was accused of various misdemeanours, and of premunire, in a schedule of no less than forty-six articles, the charges in which, as given by Foxe, are simply frivolous. The result of the impeachment was his imprisonment for the costs of the prosecution, and he was still confined at Mary’s accession. His chief accusers amongst the clergy were Thomas Young, whom Queen Elizabeth subsequently made Bishop of St. David’s and Archbishop of York; and Rowland Meyrick, whom she made Bishop of Bangor, both violent Reformers. They are guilty, if Ferrar was not, and in either way the promoters of the Reformation gained no credit.

NICHOLAS RIDLEY was the ablest of all the Reforming prelates, and the most implacable and uncompromising denouncer of the religion of his fathers. He was, in many respects, the least criminal of the

English Reformers, but by no means rises to the level of a good man or a good citizen. "When Edmond Bonner," observes Dr. Littledale, "was deprived of the Bishopric of London, for no other reason than scrupling to preach a blasphemous, immoral, and irrational sermon, Ridley not only concurred in the sentence, but tried for the see himself. He obtained it by a gross act of simony, assigning away, four days after his promotion, the four richest manors of the see, including Stepney and Hackney, to the King and the courtiers. He was active as a persecutor, and his name was one of those signed to the warrant for burning Van Parre. His theological learning and acuteness far exceeding that of his colleagues (some of whom, as Cranmer and Latimer, were very ill read in divinity) aggravates his offence in sanctioning the neologian changes introduced in the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI. He knew that they were contrary to the whole chain of Christian doctrine, that they were the suggestion of a factious foreign minority, that they would give rise to grave scandals, and could by no possibility do good; and yet, while admitting his dislike to them, he yielded, rather than oppose the worst members of the Council. Had he believed the changes to be doctrinally sound, no charge of this kind could be made against him; but, counting them, as he did, to be bad, he stands guilty of betraying the Faith, as he held that Faith to be. His crime in illegally beating down the altars in his diocese at a time when the First Book of Edward VI., wherein the altar is statutably ordained, was in force, has been referred to in the text. But the offence becomes much worse when we have regard to Heylin's account of the first destructions of the kind. He alleges that while

Hooper's object was to bring in a new doctrine, invented a few years before by Zuinglius, the motive of the Council, as well as of the mobs which had already pulled some altars down, was to have an excuse for plundering all the plate and jewels, because these, in the absence of altars, would no longer be necessary appurtenances of churches. The event was not doubtful for a moment, and Ridley cannot be acquitted of playing into the hands of the robbers. He was one of the most active members of the conspiracy of Northumberland and Cranmer to set aside Mary and Elizabeth and to put Lady Jane Grey upon the throne, and he preached strongly against Queen Mary's title. Thus far the five episcopal victims of Mary Tudor."

Mr. Froude entertains no good opinion of John Bale. Far from it: he describes him as a "foul-mouthed ruffian<sup>8</sup>." In the reign of Henry VIII. Bale belonged to the Cranmer and Poynet party, and practised the same duplicity, sometimes celebrating Mass in the King's presence. In the reign of Edward VI. he was as mischievous in exciting disturbances as Peter Martyr and Poynet. The Earl of Warwick, his patron, created him Bishop of Ossory in Ireland, from which he was ejected in Mary's reign. In Elizabeth's reign, notwithstanding his well-known character, he was held sufficiently virtuous to hold a high position in the diocese of Oxford. It is a curious circumstance, by no means complimentary to the diocese of Oxford, that Curwen was bishop thereof at the time of Bale's accession as dean or canon. This Curwen had been previously expelled for indescribable wickedness from the Archbishopric of Dublin by Loftus, the Primate of

<sup>8</sup> Froude's "History of England," vol. vii. p. 175.

Ireland, for, as he stated, “crimes unfit to relate;” but as Elizabeth and Cecil thought it necessary to provide for him in consequence of the great assistance he had given to the Reformation, Oxford was favoured with the worst specimen of episcopal wickedness that bad age produced. He was, if possible, more depraved than Bale, the “gifted and the fallen.” His contemporary, John Hales, a contemporary Protestant preacher, states that Bale was “filthy in his language when drunk, a blasphemer at all times, and a most constant liar.”<sup>9</sup> Here is Dr. Littledale’s portrait of this prominent Reformer:—“This man, following the example first set by Luther, began by breaking his vows as a Carmelite monk, and married, and then became chaplain to the adulterous Poynet, the intruded Bishop of Winchester. Of his style, Dr. Maitland says that ‘he is the fittest person to take the lead’ on such an occasion as giving examples of ‘senseless cavilling, scurrilous railing and ribaldry, the most offensive personalities, the most reckless imputation of the worst motives and the most odious vices,’ employed by Puritan controversialists. He then remarks on his ‘petulant ferocity,’ but declines even to mention some of his ‘filthiest productions.’ And of his trustworthiness, the great scholar Henry Wharton wrote to Strype, who gladly availed himself of Wharton’s aid, ‘I know Bale to have been so great a liar that I am not willing to take any thing of that kind—*i. e.* a judgment as to the character of an opponent—upon his credit.’ It is worth while to say again that this is the man who has painted Bonner’s portrait for us, followed by such copyists as Foxe, Burnet, and Strype.” All writers agree that Bale was

<sup>9</sup> John Hales’ “*Sermons on the Sins of Great Men.*”

one of the most learned of all those who abandoned Church vows and other sacred ties at this dismal epoch. His versatility was exhibited in connexion with the drama, as he wrote “God Hys Promises: A Tragedie or Interlude manyfestynge the Chyefe Promises of God unto Man in all Ages, from the Begynnyngynge of the World to the Death of Jesus Christ, a Mysterie, 1538.” Baker says this was the first dramatic piece ever printed in England. The interlocutors, or *dramatis personæ*, are Patercœlestis, Justus Noah, Moses Sanctus, Esaias Propheta, Adam primus Homo, Abraham fidelis, David rex pius, and Johannes Baptista. Dodsley has copied the work in his “Biographia Dramatica.” It was printed by Charlewood in 1577, and was acted several years previously at the Market Cross of Kilkenny, during Bale’s residence in the “Marble City” as Bishop of Ossory.

JOHN JEWELL, Bishop of Salisbury, became, according to his biographer Mr. le Bas, a Protestant as early as 1539, if not before, but he remained judiciously silent as to his opinions as long as Henry VIII. lived. Under Edward VI. he avowed himself; but at the very first menace of the storm under Mary, against whom he had conspired, he abjured, and signed a recantation, and even then fled for his life. This might be condoned as mere human weakness were it not for the hypocrisy of his dying words, wherein he said that his one great desire in life had been to be a martyr, but that he had no opportunity afforded him.

WILLIAM BARLOW, originally a Canon Regular of St. Augustine, was Prior of Bisham, and in 1535 actively assisted Henry VIII. in his divorce and the spoliation of the monasteries, for which he was made Bishop of

St. Asaph, and thence promoted to St. David's. While occupant of that see, preferring to live at Abergwili, he stripped the lead off the palace of St. David's, and sold it, embezzling the price, and letting the palace go to ruin, so that the repairs would have needed twelve years' revenue of the see. Under Edward VI. he avowed himself a Protestant, and was rewarded with the richer mitre of Bath and Wells, from which he immediately alienated eighteen manors to the Protector Somerset as the fee for his promotion. He had also broken his vows and married. When Mary came to the throne he immediately recanted, and even wrote a strong book against the Reformation, whose authenticity Burnet questions, seemingly for no other reason than that such duplicity reflected dishonour on Barlow. When Elizabeth succeeded, Barlow recanted again. He had by his wife Agnes Welleshorne five daughters, who subsequently married five "Reformed" priests, who in due time became five "Reformed" bishops. One of those ladies had the rare distinction of a duplex episcopal espousal—her first husband being a suffragan bishop, and her second an Archbishop of York<sup>1</sup>. Pilkington, Bishop of Durham, was fined by Elizabeth for being able to give his daughter 10,000*l.* as a marriage portion. Bishop Barlow must have had a goodly portion of the "world's gear" to procure the marital devotion of five prelates, whose sense of duty in spiritual matters must have been rendered more acute by seeing the result of the new order of things. Nothing in the history of the Irish Church to equal this.

In preceding chapters the reader has seen the part

<sup>1</sup> Goodwin's "Anecdotes of English Bishops;" Anthony Wood, Athen. Oxen. vol. i.; Dodd, vol. i. p. 375.

enacted by LATIMER in Henry's and Edward's reigns. We are indebted to Dr. Littledale for a stern and remarkable portrait. If history were honestly written, Hugh Latimer would change places with Edmond Bonner, and appear as the "coarse, profane, unscrupulous, persecuting bully" which Bonner is usually styled, and with the special brand of cowardice besides, of which no man could accuse Bonner. Latimer was a coward, for he recanted no less than *four times* under Henry VIII.—in 1529, when charged with heresy before Cardinal Wolsey, "where," Foxe admits, "he was content to subscribe and graunte unto such articles as they propounded unto him." He came up again before Primate Warham in 1531, and abjured a second time. He appeared before Henry himself later, and made an unreserved submission of himself to the King in all spiritual matters. Lastly, when imprisoned for heresy along with Bishop Shaxton, towards the close of Henry's reign (1546), he abjured *a fourth time*, to save his life. Thus he dissembled not once or twice, but for nearly twenty years. He was perjured and unscrupulous, for he accepted a bishopric in 1535, being then a Protestant, and swore to the oath in the Pontifical (about whose meaning there was no doubt), pledging himself to obedience to the usages and doctrines of the Catholic Church. How he kept that oath is a matter of history; but it may be mentioned that the main charge under which he was deprived by Henry VIII. was for *open violation of the Good Friday fast*—a custom not easily chargeable with dangerous superstition. Mr. Froude aptly remarks of a less flagrant violation of the day of abstinence, 'that it was in that era just as if a bishop of our time were to go to the theatre on Sunday

—a mere wanton insult to general religious feeling.' Latimer's coarseness and profanity are not left to conjecture, nor to the bias of partisans. He has given ample proofs of them under his own hand in his still extant sermons. It may be pleaded that these faults were those of the age rather than of the man. I can only answer that those who say so can know very little of contemporary homilists. Latimer was a persecutor too. His name appears as one of the bishops who sat to try John Lambert, who was in 1538 burnt for disbelieving Transubstantiation, which Latimer had himself abandoned in 1529. Nor can it be pleaded that he was forced to be present, having had no share in the matter, for he and Cranmer actually endeavoured to make Lambert recant the very opinions they held themselves. Latimer's signature also appears attached to the death-warrant of Joan Boucher." Notwithstanding, however, all the miserable demerits of Latimer, we protest against his being sent to the stake, however he might have deserved the pillory.

ROBERT HOLGATE, a monk of the order of Sempringham, became the successor of Archbishop Lee in the diocese of York. Before his consecration he took the following oath of supremacy to Henry VIII. :—"I, Robert Archbishop of York elect, having now the veil of darkness of the usurped power, authority, and jurisdiction of the See of Rome clearly taken from mine eyes, do utterly testify and declare in my conscience that neither the See nor the Bishop of Rome, nor any foreign potentate, hath, or onght to have, any jurisdiction, power, or authority within the realm, neither by God's law, nor by any just law or means." Dr. Kitchen, Bishop of Llandaff, subscribed to the same oath ; as

did Ferrars, Bishop of St. David's, at a later period<sup>2</sup>. Dr. Whyte considers Holgate as a disciple of Cranmer. Another contemporary (Pomeroy) affirms that Holgate "was a lover of 'good belly cheer' and strong liquor." "It was bruited [reported] that he had a wife and children residing at one of the see houses." "He was a fearful hypocrite, and lived in adultery with the wife of his gardener. He was a disgrace to the Reformed Church of England, and died in a bad condition, covered with a leprosy of immorality<sup>3</sup>." Such is the picture drawn of Archbishop Holgate by Hales, the preacher, who was himself a moral and an honest man. Upon the accession of Queen Mary, Holgate was one of the seven bishops superseded by Gardiner at the special command of the Pope<sup>4</sup>. These prelates were either married or uncanonically appointed, according to Cranmer's "new ordinall." Parker, a Puritan preacher, states that Holgate died happy and contented, was a great searcher of the Scriptures, and abhorred the Bishop of Rome for his tricks to levy money<sup>5</sup>. Father Pemberton makes the opposite statement as to how Holgate ended his days. Collier affirms that Holgate was not of the most unblemished character. He had betrayed his see, and surrendered many of its most valuable manors to the King. Besides this, he lay under an odious imputation with respect to his marriage. In Edward's reign the Council commanded Dr. Rookesby and two other commissioners to investigate and examine

<sup>2</sup> Strype's "Cranmer," vol. i. p. 134.

<sup>3</sup> Halo's Sermons on "The Death-bed of Rich Sinners."

<sup>4</sup> Dodd's "Church History," vol. i.

<sup>5</sup> Parker's "Accounts of the Papists who became Protestant Christians."

a case in which a man named Norman claimed *the* Archbishop's wife as his "*own real wife*."<sup>6</sup> Archbishop Holgate was imprisoned in the Tower for eighteen months, and then discharged at the "request of King Philip, who besought the Queen to pardon a great many prisoners?." Philip has been always represented as the *beau ideal* of a gloomy persecutor. Yet we find Strype, the worshipper of the chief Reformers, and several Protestant writers of veracity, proving that Philip was not the instigator of any persecution, and often interceded with effect for those who suffered from it, or for the numerous treasons, the punishments for which later writers have dishonestly confounded with inflictions for so-called "heresy." Holgate died in 1555, very wealthy. He had five residences. At Battersea his chests contained 300*l.* in gold coin; plate gilt, 1600 ozs.; mitre, gold, with two pendants set with very fine diamonds and precious stones, &c., weight, 125 ozs.; and six gold rings, with emeralds and diamonds. At Cawood he had under lock 900*l.* in gold; silver plate, 760 ozs.; 2500 sheep, an enormous quantity of costly furniture, a chest full of valuable copes and vestments. His household store was also large: wheat, 200 qrs.; malt, 500 do.; oats, 60 do.; wine, five tons. He had likewise at Cawood fourscore of horses. At his other see houses he had a large amount of property<sup>8</sup>.

In a sermon preached by Dr. Gardiner before King Philip and Cardinal Pole at Paul's Cross, he makes the following allusion to the Archbishops of York and Canterbury:—"Thus while we desired to have a

<sup>6</sup> Council Book; Henry Wharton. <sup>7</sup> Strype's "Cranmer," vol. i.

<sup>8</sup> Strype's "Cranmer," vol. i. p. 444.

supreme Head among us, it came to pass that we had no head at all ; no, not so much as our two archbishops. For that, on one side, the Queen, being a woman, could not be head of the Church ; and, on the other side, they were both convicted of one crime, and so deposed<sup>9</sup>.” Holgate, like Cranmer, was a married man when enthroned Archbishop of York in Henry’s reign. The “Defender of the Faith” did not seem to know much of what was passing around him.

We find the name of RICHARD COXE among those of the Clerical Reformers of Edward’s reign. He was educated at Oxford, and is described as one of the most “book-learned” men of his time. His private character was without stain or blemish. Puritanical and cold in manner, he won little favour from the dicers and libertines who constituted the leading laymen of the Reformatio party. In 1540 he became Archdeacon of Ely, and held also the Deanery of Christ Church in Westminster; and whilst swearing fealty to the Church of Rome was secretly attached to Lutheranism, but, like Luther, would not sanction the appropriation of Church property for the benefit of the laity ; and, although brought forward in the Court by Cranmer, he never practised the deception of his patron. He was detested, of course, by the recipients of Church property, because he consistently declared that the possessions of the Church were originally intended for, and never should have been diverted from, “the poor, education, hospitality, the sustaining of a learned and virtuous priesthood whose sole duty should be the instruction of the people and the reclaiming of the fallen.” Dr. Coxe held the office of tutor to the young

<sup>9</sup> Strype’s “Cranmer,” vol. i. p. 441.

King, but was dismissed, it is said, for the liberal principles he inculcated in the mind of his pupil. A very doubtful story! In writing to Sir William Paget, Secretary of State to Edward VI., Dr. Coxe observes, “The disposition of colleges, chantries, &c., is now in hand, and ye know (I doubt not) the great lack in this realm of schools, preachers, houses, and livings for impotent or forlorn widows who are poor and miserable; and what lack there shall be utterly intolerable, if there be not a sufficient number of priests established in great circuit and great number. And, howsoever the world beset, let them have living honestly, that beggary may drive them not to flattery, superstition, and old idolatry. This I speak to you, not distrusting of the King’s Highness’s goodness on this behalf; but there is such a number of importunate wolves that be able to devour colleges, chantries, cathedrals, churches, universities, and their lands, and a thousand times as much. But, for Christ’s Passion, try to stay for once ‘impropriations.’ Our posterity will wonder at us<sup>1</sup>.” As Bishop of Ely, in Elizabeth’s reign, Dr. Coxe became a persecutor of Catholics, and made suggestions to the Government for the “further persecution of Papists,” which “suggestions” were disregarded by Sir William Cecil<sup>2</sup>. In Stevenson’s “State Papers” and the “Hatton Letter-bag” are to be found many particulars in the career of Dr. Coxe. He was no favourite at the Court of Elizabeth.

ANTHONY DELABARRE was what might be called now-a-days a “Scripture reader.” His marvellous relations respecting himself and his friends are not borne out by

<sup>1</sup> R. O. Dom., vol. lxxxiv. N. 4, orig.

<sup>2</sup> Burleigh, “State Papers.”

facts. In the words of his contemporary Griffin, his “stories were like a large quantity of dust and a few grains of corn together, when the fresh breeze and the light commeth, the dust flieth away, and, lo ! there be scarce a grain at all of what was called corn.” Delabarre’s aspirations for martyrdom in the cause of the “pure Gospel,” to use the phrase of the times, had no existence ; his austerity and Puritan manners were simulated ; he had never been a “saint of the old or the new kalendar ;” he was no fanatic—he was a man of the world. He could share in the gross indulgences of the times ; he could play at dice ; he could drink, and sing the ribald songs which amused Thomas Cromwell’s convivial hours ; but perhaps the society of John Poynt extingushed his early virtues, and made him a hypocrite. He was a strange mixture of concealed vice with some of the “goodly parts of nature<sup>3</sup>.” It may be mentioned that Dr. Maitland and Mr. Froude are at issue as to the “merits” of Delabarre. May they not, like the ancient mathematicians, be contesting about an imponderable quantity ? Mr. Froude may be assured, however, that his estimate will not be sustained if he takes the trouble of investigating the facts. Mr. Blunt’s latest researches bring us to a genuine conclusion. “Judging,” he writes, “from Delabarre’s account of himself, he was very unscrupulous, and set no value upon truth, although he talked loudly about *the truth*<sup>4</sup>.” Delabarre did not die at the stake, or on the scaffold, or in a dungeon for “preaching the Gospel,” as stated by some Puritan writers. In

<sup>3</sup> “The Tales of Jacob Godfrey,” a very rare little black-letter book, printed in 1560.

<sup>4</sup> J. H. Blunt’s “Reformation of the Church of England,” vol. i. p. 529.

1564 he was residing in Oxfordshire in easy circumstances, and actually entertained Maister Foxe at his house.

Dr. KITCHEN, Bishop of Llandaff, was somewhat of the Vicar of Bray type. He was not the original vicar, though his contemporary; but he was, like him, a signal instance of adaptiveness. He was an abbot in Henry VIII.'s time. The royal conviction of the "Defensor Fidei" about the divorce convinced the abbot, who was soon made Bishop of Llandaff. He is said to have made "many valuable suggestions to the King and Thomas Cromwell." In Edward VI.'s time he was a bishop under Cranmer's system, and when Mary succeeded to the throne the Bishop of Llandaff changed again. How can conscience possibly have given licence to such mutations as those of Kitchen and his compeers? A Catholic bishop in Mary's reign, Kitchen took the oath of supremacy to Elizabeth: he laid his conscience in the highway, and sought the highest bidder. Elizabeth became the purchaser, and Dr. Kitchen was again made a bishop, according to the principle propounded by Cranmer. The play upon the bishop's name was not undeserved; and even in the present day the man would not be found guilty of libel for saying, as was then said, that the Bishop of Llandaff was fonder of the *kitchen* than of the *Church*. Mr. Froude describes Dr. Kitchen as a man "whose character does not bear inspection." The authorities as to this prelate's disrepute are numerous<sup>5</sup>.

Mr. Froude remarks that the Aylmers, the Jewells, and the Grindals were not of the metal of which the

<sup>5</sup> Strype, Collier, Wharton; Maitland's "Essays on the Reformation;" "Parker and Camden Society's Papers;" Lingard, and Froude.

martyrs are configured; but they were “skilful talkers, admirable divines. They had conviction enough—though Jewell, at least, had saved his life by apostacy—to be quite willing to persecute their adversaries. They were as little capable as the Roman Catholics of believing that Heaven’s gatekeepers acknowledged any passport, save in terms of their own theology. On the whole, they were well selected for the work which they had to do.”<sup>6</sup> What worse men could be for a great change in an observance which affected eternal interests? Jewell has been described by a contemporary as the “flower of the Reformed bishops” before the art of honest hero-worship had existence. The writer who took the above episcopal photographs acknowledges the hollowness of his originals; and he will find it difficult to convince the honest reader that immorality and hypocrisy are amongst the fitting attributes of the apostles of a new faith. Bishop Jewell was the author of a well-known work, “The Apology of the Church of England”—a work of some ability, but far more remarkable for its suppression of facts, and for the absence of that charity which should characterize a prelate who has been described as “meek and humble of spirit.” It is worth observing, now that correct portraits of the Reforming bishops are so much sought after, that Jewell never signed the Thirty-nine Articles, and was, in fact, one of the nine bishops who disapproved of them. Others, indeed, go so far as to say that he did not believe in them.

Of many Clerical Reformers little is now known, but that they were secular priests in Henry’s reign, and under Cranmer and Somerset became Reformers;

<sup>6</sup> Froude’s “Hist. of England,” vol. vii. pp. 74, 75.

married, and carried on a fierce crusade against those who adhered to the olden creed. Dr. May, the Dean of St. Paul's, was a notable man of this class. He had a wife and ten children in King Edward's time.

In taking leave of the "Clerical Reformers," we prefer, in order to maintain the spirit of impartiality in which this work has been undertaken, to adopt the following criticism, by a living Protestant clergyman, upon the character and conduct of the Protestant dignitaries whom we have above endeavoured to sketch. "I have," writes Dr. Littledale, "indicated their specific crimes as individuals, and have said little about their corporate guilt in assisting in, or conniving at, the murders, adulteries, forgeries, robberies, and sacrileges which went on all round them. Except that Latimer once spoke against some of the worst spoliations, and that Coverdale and Ridley preached one sermon each against their pious friends who called the Holy Eucharist 'Jack in the box,' and 'Sacrament of the halter,' I can find no sign of dislike, not to say opposition, to the prevailing wickedness and blasphemy. They had none of them regard to the poor, starved by the inclosures of their commons, greedily caught up by the courtiers; no word of sympathy for the houseless monks and nuns, often aged, sick, and helpless. They were false to their God, to their Sovereign, and to the liberties of their country."

Between the Reformers of those days and the Ritualists of the present there is a resemblance and an utter contrast: the similarity is in the externals, the contrast in the heart. The leading early Reformers cannot escape the charge of being impelled by self-interest, or driven by their fears, because they gained by the change in a

temporal sense, whilst they had a natural apprehension of the tyranny of circumstances. The *present* Reformers of the Reformation, adopting the phase of Ritualism, have taken their course of action despite of obloquy, in the face of contempt, in the presence of position lost, under the pressure of personal self-denial. Those who “reformed” the Roman Catholic religion in England had, at least, the disadvantage of having their motives likely to be misconstrued, from the fact of the old Church being concurrently plundered and “reformed;” those who would now reform Protestantism are free from any such damaging assumption. The leading Reformers of England were not famed as good Christians and great scholars, nor as men of virtuous and abstemious lives—in fact, some of them inverted all their former good qualities with their change of belief; whilst the chief Ritualists of the present day seem to embrace amongst them most of the virtues which bless and the gifts which should adorn the apostles of a new era. Learning, piety, self-denial, singleness of purpose, abounding charity, large-hearted forbearance, and love seem to be the characteristics of the Ritualistic *cultus*; and whilst the elements of good survive in the human heart, even the mistakes of admitted worth and earnest desire for the truth will compel the respect of mankind. Further of them we know not than what we witnessed when the scrutiny was perfectly unseen; but we have learned enough to enforce this conscientious acknowledgment, and to silence for ever any cynicism to which, we confess, our feelings had once experienced a tendency.

## THE REFORMERS AND THE FASTS.

MUCH controversy arose amongst the Reformers as to how Lent was to be observed. Some contended that, as an old religious custom, it would be politic to preserve it; others would destroy every thing that "had a Popish origin." Several of the Council thought that the fish trade would be destroyed if Lent was set aside. Archbishop Cranmer inclined to the opinion of the majority, whatever that might be. The new preachers, however, denounced the "Long Fast" as an invention of Popery. Tongue and Joseph, two London preachers, were loud in their denunciation of that holy season; they said that "belly cheer should be taken as often as Nature desired." Tongue told his congregation that "Lent was one of Christ's miracles, which God ordained men not to imitate or follow, and that it was an insupportable burden." Many ballads and rhymes were circulated on the Lent. Some of those documents were of the grossest description, and were written by John Bale, who was also the author of a blasphemous lampoon on the Sacrifice of the Cross. Ballads were sent through the country upon the "Death and Burial of Lent." One of those publications was extensively circulated in the diocese of Winchester, and was entitled "Jack Lent's Testament." In this publication Bishop Gardiner was ridiculed for maintaining the "penitential season." Gardiner was described as "Stephen Stock-fish." He complained to Somerset of those scandalous proceedings, and the "insults that were showered upon him." The Court of Edward at this time observed the Lent, and issued an order for its observance. The King's "diet for Lent" was made public, much to the

annoyance, it was said, of the extreme party. The Reformers were in favour of “keeping the Lent, but not as a religious custom.” In what other light could it be observed? Latimer told the multitude at Paul’s Cross that “those who regarded not laws and statutes were despisers of magistrates.” “There be laws made for diet,” he says, “what meats we shall eat at all times. This law is made in policy, as I suppose for victuals’ sake, that fish might be used as well as other meat<sup>7</sup>.” Latimer thus preached by order of the Council, but practised quite oppositely, for he was noted for his disregard of any system of abstention.

John Rasper, a preacher, told the populace at Cheapside that it “was a sin against Nature to curtail the necessary quantity of belly cheer. He would have no more Lent, no more ‘unwised priests,’ no nuns; Lent was a Popish device.” Stephen Winter, a secular priest, who said he “saw the error of his way,” was “loud in his protestations against Lent, because it disturbed the regular course of belly cheer.” Roger Turner, once an Augustine friar, informed his audience that Lent “was instituted by the Pope, and then it could not be a goodly thing. It interfered with the law of Nature; it was against belly cheer; therefore they should put it down.” Stephen Rice advised the people to “search the Scriptures well, and they would find that the patriarchs respected the belly-cheer usages. He would have no more fasts got up by the Bishop of Rome. Let them have belly cheer, and then search the Scriptures; and praise the Lord on High<sup>8</sup>.”

<sup>7</sup> Strype’s “Cranmer,” vol. i.; “Sermons at Paul’s Cross.”

<sup>8</sup> Adam Goldstick’s “Account of the Lent Controversy about Belly Cheer. Simon Cusack’s Narrative on the Big Words About Belly Cheer.”

In the ale-houses the question of keeping Lent was also discussed with great bitterness ; but the majority of the people seemed inclined to preserve “ the old usage.” Some of the preachers also argued in favour of Lent ; whilst Coverdale and men of his rank were all for “ preserving the fasts of the Church.”

John Lee, who had been once a priest in the diocese of Salisbury, became one of the new preachers. He declaimed in strong language against “ the superstition of Lent.” He had permission, like other violent men of his party, to preach at Paul’s Cross, where scenes of ribaldry and blasphemy were daily repeated for the amusement of a drunken and licentious mob. John Lee told his audiences that Lent was “ a cold and unsavoury dish that disturbed the natural comforts of the belly. Lent was got up by the Pope ; then it must be — wicked. A man that is half-starved for seven weeks is not able to preach God’s Word vigorously. He (Lee) was then able in a loud voice to tell them God’s Word, because he did not observe the Popish Lent. He took plenty of belly cheer every day ; he comforted himself ; he had also the blessing of the companionship of a young wife, who cheered him on in the work of the Lord of Hosts.” “ The Pope’s priests tell you ‘ *not to wife* ’ at all, and to starve during Lent. I say to you, good people, take all the belly cheer you can procure ; and next ‘ *get wifed* ’ to a knowledgeable virgin, who will search the Scriptures with you. Good people, put away this Lent, and you will then blow off the unnatural practice of keeping men without their due allowance of belly cheer.” Adam Goldstick states that “ this goodly discourse of Father Lee was well received by the people, who were fond of belly cheer.”

Stomachic apostles are always in favour with the rich ; but to tell a plundered and hungry people to indulge in plenty was too much even for the ignorance of the masses, the very lowest and most abandoned of whom alone listened with approval to the gross materialism of Lee and his fellows. It may be mentioned that at this time the German Reformers in London are described as literally “corrupting the corrupt.” What a monumental inscription for the labours of Luther !

#### CRANMER'S LAST ACT OF STATESMANSHIP.

CRANMER evinced much hesitation in signing the document by which the young King disinherited his sisters. But the policy he pursued at this juncture was involved in mystery. The Duke of Northumberland and his co-conspirators feared and suspected one another. The Duke could not act without the Archbishop, nor the Archbishop without the Duke. Northumberland could not forget the manner in which Cranmer, at first clandestinely and then openly, aided him in the overthrow of the Protector Somerset, whose Protestantism was more popular, because more open, than that of Cranmer. The duke's and the prelate's interests seemed not identical at the period ; but the approaching death of the King brought about an apparent understanding amongst parties who still, from private malice or personal considerations, were mutually hostile. The hesitation of Cranmer arose in great measure from his conviction that the attempt to raise

NOTE.—At page 270 (“Clerical Reformers”) Bale is erroneously represented as having been appointed to a Canonry at *Oxford*, which office he refused, but accepted that of a prebendary at *Canterbury*. The remarks upon the appointment are justifiable in either case.

Lady Jane to the throne might end in disaster. In this he was provident—be it from a sense of justice or from calculation. When he at last consented to sign the patent letters for the transfer of the Crown, he stated that he had “*sworn to maintain* the will of Henry VIII., and if he signed the document in question, then he was a perjured man.” Northumberland and the Council replied “that they had also sworn to execute King Henry’s will, and if he had a conscience so had they.” He still hesitated, but—ultimately complied.

In Strype’s life of Cranmer it is stated that when Queen Mary interrogated him for his treason to her, he said “he did it unfeignedly, and without dissimulation.” A contemporary of Cranmer remarks that “the circumstances of the times were critical. Northumberland, as wicked as he was daring ; the people divided between the two religions ; Cranmer became timid, and therefore liable to err, just as the Apostles did before him.” The man who argued the merits of the “Six Articles,” or any other written assumption, with Henry VIII., could not be deficient in courage, and so this “explanation” vanishes before inquiry<sup>1</sup>.

Mr. Froude looks upon the “good Archbishop as a man who was never influenced by vulgar worldly considerations.” “While the lay ministers of Edward the Sixth,” he observes, “were sowing the wind where the harvest in due time would follow, Archbishop Cranmer, keeping aloof more and more from them and their doings, or meddling in them only to protest, was work-

<sup>1</sup> Foxe, vol. ii. p. 372 ; Burnet (vol. i. p. 258) sustains this view of Cranmer’s courage; whilst Strype (App. p. 92 ; also “*Defence against Gardiner*,” p. 286) represents Archbishop Cranmer as acquiescent in the sentiments of the royal theologian.

ing silently at the English Prayer Book. No plunder of *Church or Crown* had touched the hands of Thomas Cranmer. No fibre of political intrigue, or crime, or conspiracy could be traced to the Palace at Lambeth. He had lent himself, it is true, in his too great eagerness to carry out the Reformation, to the persecution and deposition of Bishops Bonner and Gardiner<sup>2</sup>." This challenge as to Cranmer's unselfishness can at once be answered. Mr. Froude admits that in Henry's reign Cranmer was the active co-partner of Thomas Cromwell in his measures for the confiscation of monastic property. What part did this self-denying Archbishop take in the disposal of the luckless Lord Hussey's domain and manors? Like the Seymours and Dudleys, he was surrounded by needy relatives and followers, in whose interest he was, so far, disinterested—facilely profuse in providing for them from the property of others. For instance, in the Archbishop's dealings with the diocese of Canterbury, he was several times guilty of simony and other discreditable actions. He compelled Archdeacon Wareham to resign his office for a certain sum of money, in order to confer it on his own brother, Edward Cranmer—a man of mean capacity and bad reputation. He further alienated a number of manors of the see to the King, indemnifying himself by seizing for his private emolument some of the confiscated abbey lands<sup>3</sup>. On this transaction Dean Hook says, "It will be difficult to justify Cranmer's proceedings with respect to the promotion of his brother Edward." Even Strype reluctantly admits that Cranmer was "rewarded by Somerset with a grant of Church lands for his own

<sup>2</sup> Froude's "History of England," vol. v. p. 390.

<sup>3</sup> "Archbishops of Canterbury," vol. vi.

benefit, and which was to be considered *as a compensation for the delicate part he had taken in violating King Henry's will.*" But what amount of Church property did Cranmer receive in King Henry's reign? Were not the lands attached to Bilsington and Bradsole conferred on him by the King? Was he not also the recipient of the plunder of hospitals? The King, for instance, presented him with the revenues of the hospital of St. Gregory, founded by the illustrious Lanfranc, the annual rental of which was 166*l.* 4*s.*—a handsome sum in those days. Contemporary records avouch the institution to have been of extensive benefit to the sick and needy; but Henry dismantled it, and abstracted its means, in order to "enable the Cranmer family to appear more respectable." But Cranmer did not appropriate the property of the poor to himself and immediate family exclusively. He made likewise the following apportionments to his "other relatives" and "servants":—The priory of Shelford to his brother-in-law, Harold Rosell, clerk of his kitchen; the Grey Friars, in Canterbury, to Thomas Cobham, a cousin; the priory of Pontefract to John Wakefield, controller of his household; Croxden, or Roncester, to his "servant," Francis Basset; and Newstead (in later times the residence of the Byron family) to another "servant," named Markham<sup>4</sup>.

Cranmer's "keeping aloof from the members of Edward's Government," and "working at the Prayer Book," are not borne out by any evidence we have seen. Had he no share in the councils of Dudley, Paget, Northampton, and Dorset? Tytler, in his "Life of Edward and Mary," and the records at our hand in

<sup>4</sup> Jenkyn's "Cranmer," vol. i. p. 161; J. H. Blunt's "Reformation of the Church of England," p. 378.

the State Paper Office, differ utterly from the statements recently made respecting Cranmer's abstention from political affairs at this epoch.

#### DEATH OF EDWARD THE SIXTH.

AT ten minutes to nine of the clock on the 7th of July, 1553, Edward VI. expired. The doctors who opened his body reported "that without doubt he was poisoned," by whom could not be ascertained<sup>5</sup>. Subsequent inquiry, however, proved that no poison had been administered, but the patient was neglected, perhaps purposely. Cranmer officiated publicly at the funeral of the King in Westminster. The service was in English, which gave offence to the Princess Mary, who, on her accession, ordered a requiem Mass to be sung in the Tower Chapel for her brother. Gardiner was the officiating high priest. Pembroke, Winchester, and other colleagues of Northumberland were present<sup>6</sup>, vieing with one another in their earnest zeal to restore the "olden religion and put down heretics."

The traditions of the times furnish some curious incidents connected with Edward's death which are almost unworthy of being recorded. The "Grey Friars' Chronicle," however, presents some relations of the last evening. "The young King's death was ushered in with signs and wonders, as if heaven and earth were in labour with revolution." The "hail lay upon the grass in the London gardens as red as blood." At Middlestow, in Oxfordshire, anxious lips repeated that "a child had been born with one body, two heads, four feet, and four hands." Another account stated that a

<sup>5</sup> Strype's "Memorials;" Froude's "History of England," vol. vi. p. 58.

<sup>6</sup> Strype's "Memorials."

number of dogs were howling beneath the Princess Mary's windows. Another would have it that the night previous to the King's death "many of the Reformers were troubled with terrible dreams as to the future." It is further related, on the authority of Baoardo, "There came a storm such as no living Englishman remembered. The summer evening grew black as night. Cataracts of water flooded the houses in the city, and turned the streets into rivers; trees were torn up by the roots, and whirled through the air; and a more awful omen still—the forked lightning struck down the steeple of the church where the heretical service had been read for the first time<sup>7</sup>." The reader can draw his own conclusions as to these marvellous narratives.

The Reformers generally coincide in praise of Edward; yet Dr. Heylin considered him "ill-principled in himself, and easily inclined to embrace such counsel as was offered him." He was reared under bad men, saw no good example, and, being naturally self-willed and vain, he promised, had he lived, to prove that he was in mind, as in body, the son of Henry Tudor. Mr. Froude does not regard the youth as the precocious sage his eulogists describe, but simply considers him "a smart, intelligent boy for his time." This is about the fact. Amongst the many anecdotes of the "wise young King," it is stated that one day, passing the ruins of some monasteries, he inquired from his attendants what the buildings were, and when answered that they were religious houses, dissolved and demolished by his late father for "abuses and crimes," he replied, "Then could not my father punish the offenders, and suffer

<sup>7</sup> Baoardo, "History of the Revolution in England on the Death of King Edward."

such goodly buildings to stand, being so great an ornament to this kingdom, and put in their stead better men who might have governed and inhabited them<sup>8</sup>?" Cranmer and Paget, who had gained so much by the "dissolution and demolition," must have smiled grimly at such an unsophisticated question.

It is said, by the partisans of the cause which he unconsciously represented, that King Edward was in person beautiful. He "kept a diary in which he sketched the characters of all the chief men in the nation, all the judges and considerable men in office, their way of living, and their regard to religion. . . . . He studied the business of the mint, with the exchange and value of money. He understood fortification. He knew all the harbours in his dominions, as also in Scotland and France, and the depth of water going into them. He acquired great knowledge in foreign affairs. He took notes of every thing he heard, which he wrote in Greek characters, that those about him might not understand them, and afterwards copied them out fair in his journal or diary<sup>9</sup>." What a wonderful boy! In many attributes Edward resembled his father at the same age, Henry being a fair and loveable youth, giving no menace of his terrible maturity.

#### STATE OF PARTIES.

THE death of young Edward presented a new scene of horrors. Retaliation and vengeance was the motto of one party; defiance or dissimulation of the other. The Reformers, however, were rebels by nature, and no

<sup>8</sup> Stevenson's "State Papers."

<sup>9</sup> The "original" of Edward's Journal was long preserved in Sir John Cotton's famous library.

“constitutional historian,” like Hallam, can defend their conduct in Mary’s reign. The degradation of the national character, so far as the politicians of Mary’s day could effect it, seemed complete. The House of Peers, which a very few years before had unanimously embraced Protestantism and established it as a law, turned round, to the delight of the ruthless Renaud, and without a dissentient voice enacted penal laws against the members of the sect they had themselves so readily abandoned. It would be no misrepresentation to indicate the Spanish alliance as one of the causes of those enactments, as well as the dishonesty of the peers, the most influential of whom Renaud boasted he had bribed to the interest of the Emperor<sup>1</sup>. The Venetian ambassador, a more trustworthy authority than the Spanish and French Ministers, likewise represents the nobility and gentry of England as being utterly unprincipled. He states that they had no other religion than interest, and that, if only permitted to live in license and derive advantage from the change, they would with alacrity embrace Mahometanism or Judaism at the bidding of their sovereign<sup>2</sup>. Such was the debasement of the “upper classes” mainly produced by the wicked reign of Henry VIII. Upon the accession of Queen Mary the Parliament were almost unanimously in favour of a return to the olden religion. In the Lords every voice was raised in support of the motion. In the Commons, out of three hundred members only *two* were for maintaining the Reformation<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Tytler’s “Edward and Mary,” vol. ii.

<sup>2</sup> Correspondence of the Venetian ambassador (archives of Venice).

<sup>3</sup> Burnet’s “Reformation;” Strype’s “Memorials;” Turner, vol. x.; Lingard, vol. v.; Froude’s “History of England,” vol. v.

Nothing could exceed the enthusiasm evinced for Catholicity by those men who were but a few weeks before the patrons of the “Hot-Gospel” preachers. It was no wonder for the preachers to exclaim from the house-tops, “Alas, alas! we are betrayed and sold by the Parliament men to the Bishop of Rome.”

The Reformers at this time manifested a very unspiritual suppleness, when on Monday, November 12, 1554, the Lords and Commons passed a declaration, drawn up by the “whole Court of Parliament,” Sir William Cecil being one of those present, attesting their sorrow for past proceedings against the Pope; and all acts against him were repealed on condition that his Holiness “*would confirm them in their purchases (?) of abbey and chantry lands<sup>4</sup>.*” The world knows what sort of purchases were made by the Suffolks, Clintons, Russells, and others of the period. The acquisitions of so many leading Reformers were either bestowals, as in the Bedford case, or granted for considerations so insignificant as to make the title a gift. Julian III. actually granted the “prayer” of this worthy Parliament<sup>5</sup>; but Queen Mary was not pleased with this decision, declaring that some of the Crown lands in her possession she would “set apart for the promotion of learning and the support of the destitute of God’s creatures<sup>6</sup>. ” Bishop Gardiner remonstrated with the Queen, and assured her that if she “made such a disposal she would lack money to support her royal position.” Her Highness replied, that “she preferred the peace of her conscience to that of ten such crowns as

<sup>4</sup> Dugdale; Parry’s “Parliaments of England,” p. 211.

<sup>5</sup> Pope Julian’s Bull; also Cardinal Pole’s “Instructions.”

<sup>6</sup> “Queens of England,” vol. v.

that of England<sup>7</sup>.” Mary may have said this, or may not. If she did say it, Burnet was doing her an unconscious and unintended act of justice. Mary of the sanguinary title was a personally honest woman—her greatest enemies cannot gainsay that—and in her five years’ reign the ship of state was tossed about upon the angriest sea of passion. She had a strong heart, but not much of a head to guide; yet she honoured and observed probity in financial matters.

The “Reformed bishops” in Edward’s reign complained to the House of Lords that their jurisdiction was “scoffed at, despised, and disobeyed;” that they could not “cite before them persons of bad morals and wicked life, and that the people would not go to church, and they demanded power from Parliament to compel them to obey and hear *the Church*<sup>8</sup>.” The Peers promised to aid the bishops by an Act of Parliament, but they were not sincere. Leading a loose life themselves, they did not care to curb the inclinations of the lower and middle classes. The proposed aid to the bishops, therefore, fell to the ground. Mr. Froude states that those reformed prelates wished to be invested with the powers so long wielded by their Catholic predecessors; but the time was past for the exercise of such control. Yet Mr. Froude does not approve of the condition of affairs under the “new Church government.” Things were going from bad to worse; the churches were crumbling into ruin; parishes were still left without incumbents, or provided with curates who were incapable or unfit for the duty. A thousand pulpits in England were covered with dust; in some places four sermons

<sup>7</sup> Burnet’s “Reformation,” vol. ii. p. 296.

<sup>8</sup> Lords’ “Journals,” 3rd & 4th Edward VI.

were not heard since the Preaching Friars were suppressed<sup>9</sup>.

It is somewhat singular that in noting the origin of the Reformation in England, inquiring men who blame the London people for excesses of zeal make no account of the leaven introduced into the previous comparatively unsophisticated life of the city by the immigration of five or six thousand foreigners—the *mauvais sujets* of the Continent. Amongst these there were, of course, many sincere believers in the new order of creed—many with whom sentiment, be it called conviction, prevailed so as to order their life and action, to live in, or to die upholding. But the great bulk of these foreign immigrants were turbulent, dissatisfied, and lawless. The remains of the lansknecht of the Rhine robber chiefs, the residuum of the beaten hordes of rebels in the Low Countries, the followers of the frustrated hopes of the Huguenot leaders of France, the assumedly inspired, and the desperately aspiring, found a home about this time in England. Archbishop Cranmer lodged nearly one hundred of these foreigners in his palaces, but he had soon reason to concur in the opinion of Tyrwhitt the City mercer, when he exclaimed, “By G—, those German Reformers have left their own country for its good and our disadvantage<sup>1</sup>”—the plain-spoken citizen numbering all the evil-doers amongst the countrymen of Luther. But it was not so: impartiality portions the foreign rascaldom under many national heads; and France, it must be confessed, was not sparing of its quota. The honest mercer spoke on behoof of his

<sup>9</sup> Bernard Gilpin on the “Morals and Condytions of the Time;” Strype’s “Memorials;” Froude’s “History of England,” vol. v. p. 447.

<sup>1</sup> John Hale’s description of the “Foreign Reformers.”

trade, and translated its sentiments feelingly, because, being an honest Reformer, he was correspondingly patronized and despoiled. Many of the broils at ale-houses, described and deprecated by King Henry in his last speech to Parliament, were got up and entertained by those pestilent disturbers who made London a hot-bed of sectarian rancour and deadly strife. Most of the scenes of violence on the score of religion—which becomes a blasphemy when perverted by politics—were due to those men ; and it is only fair to the true people of London to aver that most of that lawlessness, condemned by so many writers, was attributable to the foreign element, ungovernable by law, and amenable to no divine decree. It is a deep source of regret that the open-heartedness of the English people, their hospitality, their simplicity, not only admitted this evil admixture, but allowed it the lead in their new-found zeal ; and so has the character of England suffered, and the people of London been specially disgraced, by the bitter sectarianism of selfish and unprincipled exiles. This is an item in English history not hitherto sufficiently noted. The immigration had a bad social effect. See the fine English women and girls of the time ; they were fit mothers of a noble race. Alfonso Lopez, an acute Spaniard, who visited London at the time of the christening festivities of Henry VIIth's son Arthur, drew a pleasing picture of the wives and maidens of Britain. “I was agreeably surprised,” he says, “at the beauty of the English women ; they are chaste, and their virtue is above reproach. As sweethearts, very playful, yet modest ; as wives, constant and kindly ; as mothers, most loveable. They are also much given to the practice of religion. This last, perhaps, is one of the

accounting reasons for the excellence of Englishwomen over those of other countries.” What a contrast with subsequent times!

Mr. Froude, who draws a fearful picture of the cruelties committed against the Reformers in the reign of Mary, has the candour to describe the state of public feeling produced by the administration of such Reforming statesmen as Somerset, Cranmer, and Northumberland during the brief reign of the Boy-King: “The rebellions and massacres, the political scandals, the universal suffering throughout the country during Edward’s minority, had created a general bitterness in all classes against the Reformers. The Catholics could appeal with justice to the apparent consequences of heretical opinions; and when the Reforming preachers themselves denounced as loudly *the irreligion which had attended their success*, there was little wonder that the world took them at their word, and was ready to permit the use of strong suppressive measures to keep down the unruly tendencies of uncontrolled fanatics<sup>2</sup>.”

But let the reader see what the brilliant historian states of the condition of things to which a great change had led. Thus he describes, in an antecedent chapter, the face of England altered from the old: “*To the Universities the Reformation had brought with it desolation. To the people of England it had brought misery and want. The once open hand was closed; the once open heart was hardened. The ancient loyalty of man to man was exchanged for the scuffling of selfishness. The change of faith had brought with it no increase of freedom, and less of charity. The prisons were crowded, as before, with sufferers for opinion, and the creed of a thousand years*

<sup>2</sup> Froude’s “History of England,” vol. vi. p. 529.

was made a crime by a doctrine of yesterday. Monks and nuns wandered by the hedge and the highway as missionaries of discontent; and pointed, with bitter effect, to the fruits of the new belief, which had *been crimsoned in the blood of thousands of the English peasants*<sup>3</sup>.” Dean Hook corroborates the dark portraits drawn by Mr. Froude of those times. “No mistake,” he says, “can be greater than that which would represent the Reformation as a struggle for freedom. This mistake, however, has rendered the name of Protestant dear to the politician, who, regardless of religion, has inscribed ‘civil and religious liberty’ on the banner of his party.” Again, he observes, “The notion of religious liberty or even of toleration never entered into the minds of any Reformer of the sixteenth century.” And he adds that the “Papal party were determined to maintain their principles by a similar policy.” Perfectly true; but the Papal party were robbed of their property, and had much greater reason to sternly maintain their principles. As to the state of the country, it may be imagined from the fact that *seventy-two thousand* persons were put to death on the scaffold during the reign of Henry VIII.!

## NORTHUMBERLAND'S TREASON.

To the great astonishment of the whole kingdom, the first proclamation issued on the death of King Edward was one announcing a change in the succession, and proclaiming Jane Dudley Queen Regnant of England. But the usurpation and treason of the Council, and the regal position of Lady Jane were of brief duration. Northumberland's efforts to arouse the country to sup-

<sup>3</sup> Froude's “History of England,” vol. vi. p. 28.

port the claims of his daughter-in-law were an utter failure ; his men deserted him, his colleagues wavered, and when he left London the citizens declared in favour of Queen Mary, and the provinces followed their example. The royal standard was soon surrounded by all the chivalry of the kingdom. The Earls of Sussex and Bath deserted Lady Jane, and repaired to Framlington to "salute the new Queen." Pembroke, Winchester, and Paget quickly joined the winning side. Northumberland was at Cambridge when he heard that London had declared for Queen Mary. "Struck with terror, he went to the market-place, and, taking off his cap, proclaimed Mary as Queen of England." The day before, in the same place, he had spoken of the Queen and her religion in terms of scorn. He now described her "as a good and merciful woman." The "hot-Gospel" men who were in his train became shocked at his conduct, and assured him "that whoever the Queen might pardon, she was certain to give no mercy to him, because he had led them all astray." Even those who remained with Northumberland were ready to betray him, or to sell one another. Sir John Gates, a zealously-professing supporter of Queen Jane and the Reformation "three days before," arrested his "chief when half undressed, reviling him as a traitor to his sovereign and the olden religion of the realm." In a few hours later Lord Arundel arrived in Cambridge, and made prisoners of Northumberland, Gates, Palmer, and other leading rebels, who were escorted by a strong military force to the Tower to await their trial for high treason<sup>4</sup>.

<sup>4</sup> Tytler's "Edward and Mary," vol. ii. 1st edition ; "Queens of England," vol. v. ; Lingard, vol. v.

Lord Arundel next received orders from the Queen to arrest the Duke of Suffolk and his daughter, Lady Jane. The Duchess of Suffolk threw herself at the Queen's feet, and begged for mercy on behalf of her husband. She stated that Suffolk was dangerously ill, and to be consigned to a cell in the Tower would cause his death. He was only three days imprisoned when set at liberty<sup>5</sup>. It is singular how the haughty Duchess of Suffolk almost enjoyed the friendship of the Queen, and yet seems to have made no attempt to save the life of her unfortunate daughter, whom, it is said, she always disliked. "No pleadings are recorded," says Miss Strickland, "of the Duchess of Suffolk for her hapless daughter, Lady Jane, who might have been liberated on her own parole with far less danger than her wrong-headed father. It was well known that the Duchess was an active agent in the evanescent regality of her daughter; she had urged her unfortunate marriage with young Dudley, and the Duchess had carried Jane's train as Queen. She must have fabricated some tales against her own child, since she was always treated with great distinction by her cousin, Queen Mary, in the worst of times<sup>6</sup>." The imperial ambassadors urged the Queen to bring Lady Jane to trial with her father-in-law, Northumberland; and a large number of Catholics, who wished for vengeance, and disgraced the Queen by their actions, were "loud in their demands for the blood of Jane," who has been described as the "most innocent of all the guilty." The Queen made a general reply to the Catholic party that "she could not find it in her heart or conscience to put her unfor-

<sup>5</sup> Holinshed's "Chronicle;" Goodwin, pp. 332, 333.

<sup>6</sup> Miss Strickland's "Queens of England," vol. v. pp. 300, 301.

tunate kinswoman to death, who had not been an accomplice of Northumberland, but merely an unresisting instrument in his hands. If there was any crime in being his daughter-in-law, even of that her fair cousin Jane was not guilty, for she had been legally contracted to another, and therefore her marriage with Lord Dudley was not valid ; as for danger existing from the pretensions of Lady Jane, the Queen considered them imaginary, and every requisite precaution should be taken before she was set at liberty<sup>7</sup>.” Such was the reply given by the Queen to the open and concealed enemies of Lady Jane. Bishops Gardiner, Tonstal, and the Duke of Norfolk all approved of this merciful policy. But Pembroke, Winchester, Paget, and Cecil, “the late supporters and council of Jane,” were determined to take another course in their newborn zeal for Queen Mary. Jane’s mother remained silent, whilst her father showed his gratitude for the royal mercy by forming fresh conspiracies.

Lady Jane sent a letter of explanation to Queen Mary, in which she minutely detailed the coercion which was used towards her by Northumberland and her own family. “She refused the crown ; she spoke of the injustice of the whole proceeding ; she would have nothing to do with their evil deeds. They told her that by virtue of the King’s will she was Queen Regnant of England. Her sense of justice and honour could not believe in such arrangements ; she knew nothing of the doings of the Council ; she was again reminded of her duty ; she fell to the ground and swooned as one dead. She remained a passive victim to the ambition of her father-in-law.” She concludes her narrative by describing the conduct

<sup>7</sup> Pollino, “Istoria del’ Ecclesia d’Inghilterra,” p. 73.

of young Dudley and his mother: “*I was maltreated by my husband and his mother.*”

There is every reason to believe in the accuracy of the above statement, which has been chronicled by three Italian historians who seem to have had good sources of information at the time. Miss Strickland and other eminent English writers accept it as a true narrative, and later researches prove it.

Lady Jane was committed to the Tower; and those who so recently shouted, “Long live Queen Jane!” were now preparing to give a splendid greeting to Mary Tudor as Queen Regnant of England.

The Queen’s reception on her arrival in London (August 3rd) was enthusiastic. The “Queen was mounted on a small white nag, the housings of which were fringed with gold. Her Highness was dressed in violet velvet, looked rather fresh-coloured, and was smiling and waving her hand to the people all along. One thousand gentlemen, in velvet coats, embroidered cloaks, and gold chains, preceded her on horseback. She was accompanied to the City gates by three thousand horsemen from Norfolk in uniforms of blue, green, and white, with banners and music.” Four hundred and sixty ladies formed an interesting part of the procession; “the married dames rode first, then the young comely maidens of qualitie, in the centre of whose ranks were the Queen and her fair young sister Elizabeth.” The nobility, country squires, the Lord Mayor of London, City aldermen, merchants, and burghers were present, and accompanied their Sovereign to the gates of the Tower. Here a novel sight presented itself to the new monarch. Kneeling on the little green just before St. Peter’s Church, within the fortress, were the state pri-

soners, male and female, Papal and anti-papal, who had been detained in prison during the reigns of Henry VIII. and Edward VI. There was Edward Courtney, the tall, handsome heir to the earldom of Devonshire, who had grown up a prisoner from his tenth year without education ; there was another early friend of the Queen's, the once proud Duchess of Somerset ; the aged Duke of Norfolk, on whom long imprisonment and the wreck of his family seemed to have made an impression ; Cuthbert Tonstal, Bishop of Durham, Stephen Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, and several persons of less note. Dr. Gardiner addressed the Queen in the name of his fellow-prisoners. He congratulated her Highness on her accession to the throne, and besought her to extend mercy and kindness to all. A contemporary states that Gardiner's short speech was, perhaps, one of the most feeling and eloquent addresses he had ever uttered.

The Queen raised the prisoners one by one (the bishops the first) and kissed them, telling them that she set them free. Gardiner and Tonstal were on the following day restored to their respective sees, and the Duke of Norfolk to his honours and estates ; Courtney's mother was made lady of the bed-chamber to the Queen ; the Duchess of Somerset and her daughters were restored to their rights ; and restitution of some kind or other made to all the victims of Northumberland's rule. Bonner and the bishops who were imprisoned in the Fleet were also released, and Stephen Gardiner sworn into office as Lord High Chancellor of England. Tranquillity seemed to be now restored, but the calm was brief before new treasons and outbreaks lit the flames of religious persecution.

One of the first acts of the new Government was to

issue a special commission for the trial of Northumberland and other rebels. On Friday, the 18th of August, 1553, Northumberland and his companions were arraigned in Westminster Hall, the Duke of Norfolk presiding. The trials occupied a short time. Northumberland confessed his guilt; Lords Northampton and Warwick came next. The former said he had been "amusing himself in the country, and had nothing to do with giving away the crown, but acknowledged that he was a rebel to his lawful sovereign." The young Lord Warwick declared that he acted on his father's instructions, and that he would now share his fallen fortunes. Seven were condemned to death on this occasion, but only three suffered—namely, Northumberland, Sir John Gates, and Sir Thomas Palmer<sup>8</sup>.

In a conversation with Sir Anthony Brown, in the brief interval between his fall and death, Northumberland said that "he was naturally inclined to belong to the olden religion of England, but when he saw the great change at hand, he was under the impression that it would be better to adopt the new order of things; that still he hesitated, but ultimately embraced in full the principle of siding with the strongest, explaining in his own quaint words, 'Pull dog, pull devil; ' whoever succeeded should have his adhesion."

Warwick was known in Edward's reign to have no other religion than interest; and it is alleged that on one occasion he spoke with such contempt of the merits of the "new learning," that Archbishop Cranmer "challenged him to a duel<sup>9</sup>." Cranmer's "challenge to a

<sup>8</sup> Harleian MSS. 284; "Queen Jane and Queen Mary," pp. 18, 19; Froude's "History of England," vol. vi. pp. 68, 69.

<sup>9</sup> Parker, Ant. Brit. p. 341; also Strype, p. 430.

duel" originated with his secretary, Maister Morrice, many of whose statements are pure fiction. Apart from his clerical office altogether, Cranmer was not the man to fight duels. He was too fond of his family and the social comforts of Lambeth Palace to risk his life for, of all things, a religious controversy, after having escaped so many storms in the former reign. But there was no disagreement of action between the Archbishop and Warwick; and whatever difference of opinion existed between them as to the merits of creeds, they both pulled steadily together to overthrow the olden religion. It was likewise an established understanding between both never to quarrel where their worldly interests were concerned. So far for Parker and Strype on this matter.

When in power, Northumberland offered the bishopric of Rochester to John Knox in order to silence him; but Knox declined his favour, declaring him to be "a hypocrite in religion, and that if he had any real sentiments of Christianity in his heart, he was still attached to the fabric of Rome<sup>1</sup>." The sequel proved that Knox had formed a correct estimate of the "reforming" duke. Whilst under sentence of death in the Tower he was visited by Bishop Gardiner, to whom he solemnly declared that he was a Catholic—that he had always been one in his heart, and that he did not believe in any one of the doctrines that he professed and enforced in Edward's reign. He besought Gardiner on bended knees to spare him. "Alas, alas!" he mournfully ejaculated, "is there no help for me? Oh, good Bishop—oh, anointed servant of God, let me live a little longer to do penance for my sins! Oh, spare me—spare me, good father!"

<sup>1</sup> Burnet's "Reformation."

Tell the Queen that I will be the most humble and faithful of her subjects—that I will go forth to proclaim her titles and virtues in every end of the land.” Strypo states that Northumberland’s supplications to Gardiner partook of an abject condition of mind. “Alas, alas! let me live a little longer, though it be in a mouse-hole!” To which Dr. Gardiner replied that “he wished it were in his power to give him that mouse-hole, but it should be the best palace he possessed.” The stern heart of Gardiner was moved; he promised to intercede with the Queen, and found Mary inclined to mercy; but Northumberland’s implacable personal enemy, Renaud, boasts that he overcame the Queen’s clement tendencies, and forced on the execution.

There seems to be some diversity of opinion on this question. Commendone, the Legate of Julian the Third, states that he was about leaving London, when the Queen “insisted on his stopping two days longer that he might have the pleasure of witnessing the execution of the traitor Dudley.” Some Catholic writers deny that Mary ever said so; but amiable as she might be—even when under the influence of religion—she was every inch a Tudor, and although the statement may be surcharged, it is not improbable. Northumberland had sinned deeply against her as religionist, woman, and Queen. It was not in human nature that she could forget and forgive the too recent message he had sent to her, reminding her “that she was illegitimate, old, and deformed, belonging to an idolatrous religion; a person unfit to be a Queen, and should therefore submit to her sovereign lady Queen Jane<sup>2</sup>.” This was not language for a Tudor to forget. When the “first council”

<sup>2</sup> State Papers of Mary’s reign; Tytler’s “Edward and Mary.”

of Lady Jane Grey's short-lived Government was summoned, the Duke of Northumberland spoke of the Princess Mary in these words:—"His late Majesty (Edward) had prayed on his death-bed that the Almighty God would protect the realm from false opinions, and especially from those of his unworthy sister. The King reflected that both the Lady Mary and the Lady Elizabeth had been cut off by Act of Parliament from the succession as illegitimate. The Lady Mary had been disobedient to her father, she had again been disobedient to her brother, she was a capital and principal enemy of God's Word, and both herself and her sister Elizabeth were bastards." This speech of the traitor lord was repeated to Mary three days subsequently by one of Northumberland's own council. Tytler and other modern authorities are of opinion that there can be little doubt that from the first the Queen's resentment was so strong that she had determined to strike off Northumberland's head. In fact, he was the enemy of the Tudor family, and those who applauded his treason to Mary must have perceived that he was as great a traitor to Elizabeth. As in most historical narratives, the evidence appears to be rather conflicting. Maister Holinshed, who may be considered as a good authority on this particular question, declares "that there was great difficulty in bringing the Queen to consent to the death of the Duke of Northumberland; she had known him so long, and he had once rendered her kind offices when the Lady Mary."

Gregorio Leti states that the Princess Elizabeth wrote to the Duke at this period "full of indignation for his treason to her sister and herself." She also denounced Lady Jane as a rebel, and subsequent cir-

cumstances proved that Elizabeth never forgot the blow struck at her sister and herself by the aspiring house of Dorset. Northumberland seemed to have more than a common fear of death. The night before his execution he wrote a supplicating letter to Lord Arundel, in which he besought his life to be spared on any condition. "Yea, the life of a dog," he wrote, "that I may live to kiss the Queen's feet<sup>3</sup>."

All earthly hope had now passed away from Northumberland, and he earnestly set about preparation for his doom. The last Mass at which Northumberland and his condemned associates were present was celebrated by the new Lord High Chancellor of England, Stephen Gardiner, from whom the Duke and his companions received the Holy Sacrament<sup>4</sup>. "The prisoners," writes a spectator, "bent on their knees one to another to ask pardon, and the Duke knelt before each of them to seek their forgiveness. 'I am,' said he, 'the wicked wretch who has brought you all to this terrible end. Oh, brothers, forgive me!' They all embraced him. It was a sad scene." Bishops Heath and Bonner accompanied the prisoners to the scaffold.

At thirty minutes past ten of the clock on Tuesday morning, 22nd of August, 1553, the "tolling of divers big bells," and then the roll of a drum, announced to the vast crowds on Tower Hill that the Duke of Northumberland and his companions were approaching. The Duke walked with a firm step, but looked pale and dejected. Bishop Heath stood beside him, crucifix in hand. As usual, Northumberland's dress was courtly and magnificent; and he ascended the scaffold with

<sup>3</sup> Tierney's "Hist. and Antiq. of the Castle of Arundel," p. 333.

<sup>4</sup> Harleian MS.

courage and dignity, repeating the prayers of the bishops and clergy in a clear and distinct voice. Then a dead pause of some minutes occurred. Sir John Gates first addressed the populace, and said he deserved a thousand deaths ; he begged the forgiveness of all those whom he had injured, and especially that of the man whom he had so basely betrayed. He had lived viciously and as wicked all his life as any man in the world, and yet he was a great reader of the Scripture ; but a worse follower of the maxims of the said Scriptures there was not living. He read it not to edify, but to dispute, and to make interpretations after his own fancy. He exhorted the people to take heed how they read God's word, and played and gamed with God's holy mysteries. Unless they humbly submitted themselves to God, and *read His word charitably and to the right intent to be edified thereby, it would be poison to their souls.* Sir Thomas Palmer said he regretted his crimes against the Queen, and besought the prayers of the people, and told them to remember that he died in the olden religion of England<sup>5</sup>. Strype contends that, although Gates and Palmer attended Mass that morning and received communion with Northumberland, nevertheless at the scaffold they were stanch Protestants. Strype no doubt adopts the assertion of Foxe, who has given so many imaginative scenes in cell and on scaffold, at a time when he himself was a traitorous exile in Switzerland. What manner of men would Foxe make of Gates and Palmer, who an hour before had partaken of the communion, and died declaring their Catholicity ? The ascription of such terrific duplicity is one of Foxe's most wicked lies.

<sup>5</sup> Harleian MSS. ; Tytler's "Edward and Mary ;" "State Trials ;" Pomeroy, Hales, and Griffin.

The Duke of Northumberland, coming to the front of the scaffold, surveyed the vast crowd for some minutes. A shout issued from the spectators, followed by a murmur and a cry of “Poor fellow, poor fellow!” He smiled at the exclamation of pity, and having waved his hand towards the people, a death-like silence followed, and the Duke made his “farewell explanation” to all parties in these words:—“Good people!—Hither I am come this day to die. I confess to you all that I have been an evil liver, and I have done wickedly all the days of my life; and of all most against the Queen’s Highness, of whom I here openly ask forgiveness” (bending his knees); “but not I alone the original doer thereof, I assure you, for there were some others which procured the same; but I will not name them, for I will not now hurt any man. And the chiefest occasion hath been *through false and seditious preachers that I have erred from the Catholic faith and true doctrine of Christ.* For, good people, there is, and hath ever been since Christ, one Catholic Church, which Church hath continued from Him to His disciples in one unity and concord, and so hath always continued from time to time until this day, and yet doth throughout all Christendom, only us excepted, for we are quite gone out of that Church. For whereas all holy fathers, and all other saints throughout Christendom, since Christ and His disciples, have ever agreed in one unity, faith, and doctrine, *we alone dissent from their opinions, and follow our own private interpretation of Scriptures.* Do you think, good people, that we, being one parcel in comparison, be wiser than all the world besides, ever since Christ? No, I assure you; you are far deceived. I do not say so from any great learning that I have, for

God knoweth that I have very little, or none, but for the experience which I have had. I pray you to recollect that since the death of King Henry VIII. into what misery we have been brought, what open rebellion, what sedition, what great division hath been throughout the whole realm ; for God hath delivered us up to our own sensualities, and every day we wax worse and worse. Look also in Germany, since they severed from the faith ; into what a *miserable state they have been brought, and how the realm is decayed.* And herewith I have braved these preachers for their doctrine, and they were not able to answer any fact thereof, no more than a little boy. They opened the books, and could not reply to them again. More than that, good people, you have in your creed, *Credo Ecclesiam Catholicam, which Church is the same Church, which hath continued ever from Christ, throughout all the Apostles, saints, and doctors' times, and yet doth, as I have said before ; of which Church I do now openly profess myself to be one, and do steadfastly believe therein.* I speak unfeignedly, from the bottom of my heart. This good man, the Bishop of Worcester, shall be my witness" [the bishop said, "Yea"]. "And I beseech you all bear me witness that I die therein, and I do think if I had this belief sooner I had never come to this pass ; wherefore, I exhort you all, good people, take you all examples of me, and forsake this new doctrine betimes. Defer it not long, lest God plague you as He hath me, which now suffer this vile death most worthily. I have no more to say, good people, but of all those whom I have offended I ask forgiveness, and they who have offended me I forgive, as I hope God may forgive myself. I trust the Queen's Highness hath forgiven me ; when, as I was

with force and arms against her in the field, I might have been rent in pieces without law, her Grace the Queen hath giveu me time and respect to have judgment<sup>6</sup>."

At the conclusion of the above address the Duke of Northumberland made the sign of the Cross in the saw-dust on the scaffold, and then stooped and kissed the symbol of his faith. Turning to the headsman, he said, "I am now ready. Let you and your assistants perform the part allotted to you." In a few minutes more, having submitted himself with graceful resignation to the headsman, the soul of Thomas Dudley, Viscount Lyle, Earl of Warwick, and Duke of Northumberland, passed away.

A faithful retainer, whom Northumberland neither cared for nor loved, waited on Queen Mary at Richmond, and asked for the head of his master. "In God's name," said the Queen, "take the whole body as well, and give your lord proper burial<sup>7</sup>." And John Coek buried his master in St. Peter's, in the Tower, side by side with Somerset, whom historians have called his victim, but which historic justice now accepts as a fellow offender against equity.

The Catholic party were much excited by the scene on the scaffold, whilst the friends of the Reformation were "diseoneerted and disedified" by so solemn a repudiation on the part of one who had been a leading champion of their creed for the previous sixteen years. Foxe is of opinion that the Duke "merely made a recantation of Protestantism to save his life, being trapped up by men to do so." Tytler observes that there is no

<sup>6</sup> Harleian MSS. 284, fol. 187.

<sup>7</sup> "Peerage of England," published 1709, vol. ii. p. 406.

authority for this assertion of Foxe; and Burnet was of opinion that if the Duke were really attached to any religion it was to that of Rome. A late writer, however, asserts that the Duke was “either under the influence of the superstitions of Popery or else an atheist, for otherwise he could not have made such a statement on the scaffold.” Northumberland seemed to have made friends among all the distinguished notables of his time. Early in life he became the favourite of “King Henry’s favourite,” Charles Brandon, Duke of Suffolk. He then entered the high-road to fortune, and began to exhibit those talents, and to be propelled by that ambition which carried him to so perilous a height of greatness. Patronized by Wolsey, he had the good fortune not only to escape the consequences of his fall, but to ingratiate himself with Cromwell at the time of that minister’s accession to so much of the Cardinal’s power; and when Cromwell in his turn was disgraced and executed, Dudley’s barque, so far from being wrecked by the fate of his friend, caught the gales of the royal favour, and sprang forward on its way more swiftly than before<sup>8</sup>. To sum up the estimate of Dudley’s character, notwithstanding his recantation on the scaffold, Catholics cannot overlook the fact that his speech was an acknowledgment of evil-doing which had become irreparable, nor forget this truth, that of all the bad men of the bad Council of Edward VI. the Duke of Northumberland was about the worst.

When Northumberland’s rebellion had been suppressed, and the Queen had taken possession of the seat of Government, Archbishop Cranmer remained unmolested, having merely received an order to “confine

<sup>8</sup> Tytler’s “Edward and Mary,” vol. i. p. 2.

himself to the palace at Lambeth during the Queen's pleasure." Intelligence having reached him that the Catholic service was ordered by the Queen to be restored in Canterbury Cathedral, he expressed his indignation in no measured terms, and sturdily denounced the olden faith. On the other hand, it was reported that the Archbishop "offered to celebrate Mass before the Queen." Cranmer, on becoming aware of this statement, quickly hastened to deny its truth, and in doing so spoke with scant courtesy of the Queen. He stated that the "Mass was the device and invention of the Father of Lies, who was even then persecuting Christ, His holy Word, and His Church; that it was not he (Cranmer), but a false, flattering friar and deceitful monk (Dr. Hornden), who had restored the olden worship to Canterbury; that he had never offered to say Mass before the Queen, but was willing, with her permission, to show that it contained many horrible blasphemies; and, with the aid of Peter Martyr, to prove that the doctrine and worship established under Edward VI. was the same which had been believed and practised in the first ages of the Church."<sup>9</sup> Cranmer had numerous copies of this letter circulated, and it caused much commotion among the people. He was immediately summoned before the Queen's Council, several of whom belonged to the late Government. Here he presented "a bold and uncompromising appearance" before his former friends. After two days' discussion he was committed to the Tower, on the charge "of high treason and divers other great crimes." In the Tower he remained three years, but under little or no restraint—in fact, he might have

<sup>9</sup> This declaration of Cranmer is printed at full length in Strype's "Cranmer," vol. i. pp. 437-8.

escaped to Germany if he wished to do so. His enemies were numerous, and actively engaged in seeking revenge ; but the Queen and the Bishop of Winchester, whom he had so much injured, were inclined to treat him with clemency. This statement is corroborated by state papers recently discovered.

#### PAPAL AND ANTI-PAPAL NOTABLES.

THE reader has already seen Latimer's description of the results of the changed relations of landlordism under the new order of things, and here he energetically denounces the contemporaneous bribery practised by public men of all parties in the State. The quaintness of Latimer's style imparts a show of earnestness in the cause of honesty which makes one regret the preacher's many faults.

“ I am sure,” said Latimer, “ this is *scala inferni*, the right way to hell, to be covetous, to take bribes, and pervert justice. If a judge should ask me the right way to hell, I would show him this way. First, let him be a covetous man ; let his heart be poisoned with covetousness. Then let him go a little farther and take bribes ; and lastly pervert judgment. So, there is the mother and the daughter, and the daughter's daughter. Avarice is the mother ; she brings forth bribe-taking, and bribe-taking perverting of judgment. There lacks a fourth thing to make up the mess, which, so help me God, if I were a judge, should be *hangum tuum*, a Tyburn tipper to take with him ; an it were the Judge of the King's Bench, my Lord Chief Justice of England, yea, an it were my Lord Chancellor himself, *to Tyburn with him*. He that took the silver basin and ewer for a

bribe thinketh that it will never come out. But he may now know that I know it, and I know it not alone ; there be more beside me that know it. Oh, briber and bribery ! He was never a good man that will so take bribes. We will never be merry in England till we have the skins of such."

In the reigns of Elizabeth, James I., and Charles I. men in office became if possible more corrupt, and, along with being more venal, more numerous. From Queen Elizabeth down to the ignorant Justice Shallows, who administered rural jurisdiction, lawsuits were hastened or delayed by a timely present, whether in golden angels placed under the royal pillow, or in the letter-bag of a chancellor or judge, down to a couple of chickens to the country "justice".<sup>1</sup>

With the change of religion came a mutation in the order of society, a change of taste, of habits, a new disposition of wealth, an altered mode of piety, new ideas, new notions ; but the fine old heart of the nation did not expand—the sympathy, benevolence, and charity characteristic of England did not enlarge their compass. Out of the transformation were fashioned many "fortunate" men, the founders of our present great families, and a sturdy pursy middle class grew up under the shadow of tall houses in mercantile cities, or furrowed the land with "avaricious industry." Of the former Mr. Froude is not praiseful, and of the latter he writes as follows :—"The new owners of the soil, the middle classes who had risen to wealth on the demolition of

<sup>1</sup> "Queens of England," vols. vi. and vii.; Hatton's "Letter Bag;" Sir John Harrington's "Nugæ;" Letters of Archbishop Hutton; Burleigh's State Papers; Letters of Archbishop Laud and Lord Strafford; Campbell's "English Chancellors," vol. ii. p. 266.

the monasteries, were unwarlike, men of business, given merely to sheep-farming and money-making. The peasantry hated them as chief enclosers of the commons. The Crown and the Lords despised them as the creation of a new age, while, as evading in all ways the laws of military tenure, and regarding their estates as a commercial speculation for the building up of their private fortunes, they were looked upon by Englishmen of the olden order of things as poisonous mushrooms, the unwholesome outcome of the diseases of the age.” There is, it may be, an unintentional regret exhibited in the foregoing picture which warrants a belief that the historian considers affairs were not changed for the better by the overthrow of the ancient order of things.

The Marquis of WINCHESTER was the very man who might be suspected of receiving bribes in the reign of Queen Mary<sup>2</sup>. It is now almost certified that Renaud, the Spanish Ambassador, paid him fifteen hundred crowns a year for three years. In the reign of Elizabeth he was notorious for receiving presents. During Mary’s reign he acted with the “caution and cunning of the fox.” He took example by the fate of Archbishop Cranmer and others. He conformed very rigidly to the olden religion, which he had abandoned in Edward’s reign<sup>3</sup>. On the accession of Elizabeth he avoided the scandal of another sudden change; but when a convenient opportunity occurred he adopted the “spiritual doctrines propounded” by the Queen and Sir William Cecil. He regarded nothing as sacred but interest. Naunton says: “He served four monarchs in as various and changeable seasons, that neither time nor age hath

<sup>2</sup> Grenville Papers.

<sup>3</sup> Campbell’s “English Chancellors,” vol. ii.

yielded the like precedent.” He first held office under Henry VIII. and died in the service of Elizabeth. John Knox notices him under the title of “ Shebna the Treasurer,” acting “ like a crafty fox towards King Edward and Mary, but under his outward guise concealing the most malicious treason.” “ In the last stage of his life,” says Nichols, “ the Marquis of Winchester rendered himself so agreeable to Queen Elizabeth that she declared if he were but a young man there was not a person in her dominions whom she would so soon take for a husband.” He was descended from an ancient family which “ gave England some worthy sons.” The Marquis of Winchester lived to see 113 descendants, and died as he had lived, without a show of conscience.

FECKENHAM, the last Abbot of Westminster, appears among the notables of Mary’s reign. He was chaplain to the Queen, and subsequently among the many who died from the effects of long imprisonment and cruel treatment during the reign of Elizabeth. In the days of religious persecution he followed the merciful example set by Cardinal Pole. He remonstrated with the Queen and Bishop Gardiner in the case of Lady Jane Dudley, and told her Highness that the time allotted to the young captive to “ prepare for death was fearfully short.” At his supplication a respite was granted for three days longer. He besought Lady Jane in the interval to become reconciled to the “ Mother Church,” but was unable to make any impression on her. He renewed his entreaties with Pembroke and Paget to spare her life, but in vain. Mr. Froude, in describing Feckenham’s mission to Lady Jane Dudley, says, “ He was a man full of gentleness and tender humanity, and felt to the bottom of his soul the errand on which he was despatched. He

felt as a Catholic priest but he felt also as a man.” For Elizabeth herself, in the hours of her trials, he was likewise an “intercessor, and prevented many acts of harshness from being carried out against her.” Yet she acted with deep ingratitude to the kind abbot. She stripped him not only of his Church preferments but of his private property, and many years subsequently some of his plate was recognised in the possession of her favourite, Lord Leicester. The abbot she detained in prison for five-and-twenty years, and during this period he was tortured three times, placed in a damp chamber, receiving bad food, and every indignity that it pleased the gaolers of those days to inflict. He died in one of the dungeons of that pestilential prison, the Castle of Wisbeach, in the Fens<sup>4</sup>.

Maister UNDERHILL, a Worcestershire gentleman, was sent to prison in a cruel and arbitrary manner by Mary’s Council. He had been a loyal and chivalrous subject, and when Wyatt advanced against London he at once offered suit and service to the Queen. He was a good scholar, poet, and musician, but embracing the “new learning,” he became a fierce zealot, and was designated the “Hot Gospel man.” He wrote a narrative of the “sufferings and miraculous escapes of many of the preachers in Mary’s reign.” The “narrative” is, perhaps, one of the most marvellous ever indited. As Underhill was an acquaintance of Foxe and Delabarre, it is more than probable that those choice experts in falsehood gave him assistance in his extraordinary production. The original MSS. of Underhill’s “narrative” is in the Harleian collection at the Museum.

Queen Mary has been unfairly held accountable for

<sup>4</sup> Camden; Anthony Wood; Dodd’s “Church Hist.” vol. i. p. 525.

the deeds of some of the violent members of her Council. The persecution of Judge HALES was signally unjust. He was one of those Reformers who refused to be a party to the disinheriting of the late King's daughters. He told Northumberland and Cranmer that they were traitors; that they were acting contrary to the laws of the realm, and reminded the grand juries of their allegiance to their lawful Sovereign. He was misrepresented and maltreated by all parties; but the "Queen's friends" were his enemies. He was illegally committed to the Fleet prison, and in a moment of despair attempted suicide. When the Queen heard of his unmerited sufferings she sent for him and "spoke many words of comfort to him and set him at liberty<sup>5</sup>." Maister Hales subsequently lost his reason, and in that state put an end to his existence. He was one of the few amongst the "reforming lawyers" who were honest or disinterested in their adoption of the new principles; indeed, whether Papal or anti-Papal, the lawyers and attorneys of those days were "heartless knaves and legalised thieves." Sir Thomas More considered the occupation one unfit for any honest man. Have lawyers and attorneys become more honest and humane since the days of Audley and Rich, or those of Francis Bacon and Lord Eldon? The unfortunate suitors in the Courts of Chancery, even to the present time, can, with a sad feeling, answer this question<sup>6</sup>.

<sup>5</sup> Martin's "Chronicle." Holinshed.

<sup>6</sup> In a work entitled "The Grandeur of the Law," edited by Mr. Foss, he reckons eighty-two existing peerages as springing from the legal profession. The list commences with a "Duke of Norfolk," and ends with the late "Lord Campbell," to which may be added a few more, ending with Lord O'Hagan, the second Catholic Chancellor of Ireland for 300 years.

FITZALAN, Earl of ARUNDEL, was a member of the ancient family of Howard, and an adherent of Catholicity. He wished, however, to please all parties, and held office under three English Sovereigns of different religions. He is represented as moving in a cloud, suspected of aims which he would not avow, without a conviction, without a purpose, feared by all men and trusted by none. Although Lodge and Turner have set up a vindication of Lord Arundel, it is impossible to acquit him of treachery to his friend and colleague Northumberland, whose cause he had sworn to "sustain by shedding his blood for Queen Jane." In this respect, however, he was as trustworthy as the other members of the Council. At forty-two years of age Arundel was the "sympathising friend and concealed lover of Elizabeth" in the Tower, and at forty-seven he openly professed himself as her romantic admirer. Amongst all the alleged lovers of Elizabeth he was the most sincere.

The Marquis of NORTHAMPTON was, perhaps, a Catholic from conviction, but when his interests interposed he inclined otherwise. He was tried and found guilty of high treason with Northumberland, but pardoned by the Queen. "He delighted," says Lloyd, "in music and poetry; his exercise, war; being a happy composure of the hardest and softest discipline." Some of his contemporaries represent him as "pious, gentle, and humane," others that he "was fierce and cruel in disposition and a hypocrite in religion," and again "indifferently good." The truth is, he was just suited, by his want of worth, to take rank with his fellows of the former or present Council.

WILLIAM, Earl of PEMBROKE, held office under Mary,

and was the adviser of the Council in many cruelties. At the accession of Elizabeth he was considered one of the ablest generals England possessed. He was wealthy, haughty, mean, and vindictive. His “increased attachment to the Reformation” caused him to be placed on the committee of four to determine on the change of religion. The other members of the committee were Lords Bedford, Northampton, and John Grey. They communicated with Queen Elizabeth and Cecil in private. A “council of divines” also sat in solemn deliberation, but they were the mere exponents of the Queen and her Minister’s wishes. It was a strange peculiarity of the period when generals in the army and young political adventurers were taken into conclave to fashion a creed instead of expounding military tactics. Pembroke was appointed to office under Elizabeth, to see that the new religion should be orthodoxyically settled and maintained. Mr. Froude draws this picture of the military apostle : “The Earl of Pembroke, in the black volume of appropriation, was the most deeply compromised. Pembroke, in Wilts and Somerset, where his new lands lay, was hated for his oppression of the poor, and had much to fear from a Catholic sovereign, could a Catholic sovereign obtain the reality as well as the name of power. Pembroke (so said Northumberland) had been the first to propose the conspiracy to him, and as Northumberland’s designs began to ripen Pembroke endeavoured to steal from his court<sup>7</sup>. ” There is reason to believe that Pembroke was handsomely rewarded by the Emperor Charles the Fifth for the services he rendered to the Papal Party in Mary’s reign<sup>8</sup>. As general of the royal army he

<sup>7</sup> Froude’s “History of England,” vol. vi.

<sup>8</sup> Grenville Papers, vol. iv. p. 267.

crushed Wyatt's rebellion, and his mode of doing so was treacherous and cruel. Having followed all the fantasies of Henry VIII., and obtained from him the dissolved nunnery of Wilton, Pembroke was a keen Protestant under Edward VI., and one of the first to acknowledge and then to desert Queen Jane. Queen Mary having restored Wilton to the nuns, Lord Pembroke received the abbess and her sisterhood at the gate "cap in hand." When Elizabeth subsequently suppressed the Convent of Wilton, the Earl of Pembroke drove the nuns out of their house *with his horsewhip*, bestowing upon them an appellation which implied their constant breach of the vow of chastity<sup>9</sup>. In an age rendered infamous to all time for the wickedness of its leading men, Pembroke stood in the foremost rank of the "battalion of evil."

Sir WILLIAM PAGET was the friend and co-conspirator of Somerset<sup>1</sup>, the friend of Cranmer, the friend of Poynet, the friend of Coverdale, the friend of Northumberland, the loyal subject of King Henry, of young Edward, of Queen Jane, of Queen Mary; at one time a zealous Reformer, at another the persecutor of Reformers; swore allegiance to all parties, and betrayed and deserted them when it suited his purpose. "One can scarcely recognise," writes Dr. Maitland, "the 'earnest Gospeller,' the partisan of Barnes the Martyr, in the lively Papist who received again in Queen Mary's time the Garter which had been stripped from him as a convicted

<sup>9</sup> Sir James Mackintosh's "History of England," vol. iii. p. 155; Strype's "Memorials;" Fuller's "Worthies."

<sup>1</sup> Maitland's "Essays on the Reformation," throws some light on the schemes concocted between Somerset and Paget at the period of King Henry's death.

and confessed scoundrel, and figured as Lord Privy Seal as long as Mary's reign lasted." The "dexterous and fearless Paget," as Froude styles him, was possessed of considerable talent in managing diplomacy where "high-bred insolence, petty devices, and deliberate lying were considered necessary to sustain the interests of the Government which he represented<sup>2</sup>;" but with all these qualifications for a statesman of the time, neither Cecil nor Walsingham would confide in him as a political agent. Nevertheless, he was frequently consulted by Elizabeth and her Council on questions of great national importance. Mr. Froude considers him "an honest man." And again he observes: "Paget's creed was of the broadest; he hated fanatics, he believed in good order, good government, and a good army, more than in whitewashed churches, or in doctrines of justification, however exemplary their exactness." Paget became enriched from the spoils of the Church, and the peculations practised by him as a minister of the Crown. His whole life has been summed up by a contemporary as "a tissue of ingratitude, treachery, meanness, and falsehood." Such was one specimen of the "Independent Catholic Party." What, then, was to be expected from the needy adventurers who adopted and acted on the maxim of Northumberland and Wotton—"There is much to be made by the change: I will adhere to the strongest side"?

CUTHBERT TONSTAL, Bishop of Durham, met with reverse of fortune. In early life he enjoyed the friendship of Sir Thomas More, Richard Foxe, Bishop of Winchester, Bishop Fisher, Archbishop Wareham, and other eminent scholars and divines. More states that "the

<sup>2</sup> Paget's Diplomaey for Henry VIII. State Papers, vol. x. p. 295.

world had not then anything more learned, or prudent, or better than Cuthbert Tonstal.” Archbishop Wareham was one of his immediate patrons. In a letter from Wareham to Cardinal Wolsey he speaks of Tonstal on his promotion to the see of Durham in terms of eulogy, and describes him as a man of “learning, virtue, and goodness<sup>3</sup>.” In 1541 Tonstal assisted Dr. Heath, then Bishop of Worcester, in a revised edition of the Bible. He was an eminent Greek scholar at thirty years of age, and well versed in ancient history. His private character was without reproach. All Protestant writers agree that he was moral, amiable, and benevolent. Unfortunately for his reputation as a priest he became a courtier. He advocated the divorce of Katherine of Arragon, but not with the grossness of language which disgraced Bonner. He took the oath of supremacy to the King; he was silent when Lord Cromwell and Dr. London issued their monastic reports; in 1535 he wrote to Reginald Pole, denouncing the Pope for not “quickly agreeing to the assumptions of the English King.” He preached at Paul’s Cross against the spiritual power of the Pope in England. He described Clement the Seventh in gross language as a disturber of the peace of Europe. Father Peto and the Remonstrant Friars answered him from the pulpit in a master style; they cared not for the favours or the terrors of the King. Notwithstanding the warnings he received, Dr. Tonstal still adhered to the policy of Henry and Thomas Cromwell. In this respect, however, he was no worse than the other bishops. His letters to Reginald Pole proves that he was completely in the King’s interest<sup>4</sup>. It is alleged that he was in favour of the marriage

<sup>3</sup> Wareham and Wolsey Correspondence.

<sup>4</sup> MS. Cleop. c. vi. p. 375.

of the clergy<sup>5</sup>. Be this as it may, he never violated his own vows. Upon the death of Henry he was deposed from his see, stripped of his private property, and committed to the Tower during Edward's reign. Being released from prison, on the accession of Mary, he never actively remembered his former wrongs. He never persecuted. In his broad diocese no man suffered for his belief. When Elizabeth felt herself established on the throne, she deprived him not only of his episcopal revenues, of which he had been a munificent dispenser, but of his private fortune and personal liberty. The early associations that existed between Elizabeth and Cuthbert Tonstal place the Queen's conduct to him in a very unamiable light. He was the prelate who had baptized her at Greenwich Palace, and was also one of her godfathers. For many years previous he was in the habit of sending her presents on her natal day, accompanied by some "pretty little lines," breathing good wishes for his goddaughter. Although the incarceration of this aged prelate may seem not harsh, as it presented the distinction of his being merely remitted to the "honourable custody of Archbishop Parker," the confiscation of his income of every sort was not perhaps half so annoying to Tonstal as the choice of his imprisonment. *Choice* is not the word, for the bitter irony of Cecil may be seen in the apparent leniency of its destination. No two men were more opposite in character than Tonstal and Parker<sup>6</sup>. It has been said—but falsely said—that Tonstal "opposed and then accepted." As a virtuous prelate, acting up to the dictates of his

<sup>5</sup> Collier's "Ecclesiastical History," vol. vi. p. 293.

<sup>6</sup> Aiken's "Court of Elizabeth," and Neal's "History of the Puritans," will enable the reader to judge of the merits of Archbishop Parker.

creed, he obeyed the law as it was constituted, without adopting the motives of its enactment ; he stirred up no strife against the constituted order of things, however he might regret its causes and lament its effects. If he regarded his reverses as retribution for his sins of omission, Tonstal must have accepted as the most severe incident of his punishment the fact of being given into the charge of a wedded apostate priest, who had been, against canon law, intruded into the archdiocese of Canterbury. Dr. Tonstal did not long survive the loss of his honours. He died at Lambeth Palace, Nov. 18, 1559. He was a member of an ancient family, his father being Sir Thomas Tonstal, and his mother of the honoured name of Neville.

Dr. WHYTE became Gardiner's successor in the see of Winchester. He was the first prelate whom Elizabeth deposed. On Dr. Whyte's descending from the pulpit, after preaching the funereal sermon of Queen Mary, Elizabeth ordered his arrest, and he remained in the Tower till his health was totally prostrated. He was subsequently released and permitted to reside at the house of his sister, where he died in 1561. Camden states that, although allowed to live with his relative, he was prevented from practising his religion. Camden may be considered a good authority on this matter, yet a contemporary alleges that during the incarceration of Heath, Archbishop of York, Elizabeth ordered every facility to be rendered him in the practice of his religious duties. Whyte is described by another historian “as an eminent scholar, a good poet, an able theologian, and an eloquent preacher. He was a prelate of primitive behaviour, and altogether a worthy good man.” Sir

William Cecil, in an official letter, writes of him as “sincere, honest, and hospitable, very attentive to the duties of his see, and charitable to God’s poor.” If Dr. Whyte deserved this character—which he did fully—why did Cecil advise such treatment towards him? The fact is, virtue was the very worst recommendation for prelatical prosperity in the days of Cecil and Elizabeth.

The Marian bishops were, at the death of Queen Mary, sadly and fully alive to the lamentable condition of religious affairs, the vacillation exhibited by the prelacy in Henry’s reign disappeared, and the episcopacy were ready to brave the anger of the Sovereign and the terrors of “block and dungeon.” On the 15th May (1559) the bishops, fourteen in number, were commanded to appear before Queen Elizabeth at Greenwich Palace. Cecil and Bacon were both present. Her Highness then informed the prelates that it was her will and pleasure that they should take the new form of oath prescribed for them, or else they should surrender their sees immediately. Dr. Heath, Archbishop of York, was first called upon to take the oath of supremacy. The aged prelate changed colour several times and seemed deeply affected, yet he replied in a bold and indignant tone. He told her Highness to remember what her real duty was. He admonished her to follow in the steps of her good sister, who had brought back the country to the ancient religion which had flourished in it for a thousand years. He warned her not to earn for herself the anathemas which would pursue her if she was disobedient to the see of Rome, which was the mother of all Churches<sup>8</sup>.

<sup>8</sup> There are two or three versions of Archbishop Heath’s speech extant. They differ merely in words.

After the pause of a few minutes Elizabeth replied herself, “My Lord Archbishop of York, I will answer you in the words of Joshua—‘I and my realm will serve the Lord God.’ My sister could not bind the realm, nor bind those who should come after her, to submit to a usurped authority. I take those who maintain here the Bishop of Rome and his ambitious pretences to be enemies to God and to *me*.” The Queen delivered this address in a very emphatic tone. The Bishops were ordered to retire from the royal presence, the Queen’s “pleasure” being that they should be allowed a few weeks to reconsider the question. With one exception (Dr. Kitchen) they remained firm to the faith of their fathers. They declined the oath, and were committed to the Tower, where they were compelled to pay for “their own food,” and to be “otherwise well cared.”

The subsequent fate of these prelates was that they were transferred from one dungeon to another until they all “died out.” It has been asserted that Elizabeth treated Archbishop Heath with “kindness and consideration, and frequently visited him.” In answer to this statement we have extant an order of the Privy Council, at which the Queen *was present*, commanding the “pinching and torturing of Nicholas Heath, some time Archbishop of York.” And Archbishop Heath was then in his 83rd year. Hale states that he was removed to the Tower from a country-houſe, and died there. This does not look like an improvement in the treatment he received. All historians agree in their commendations of Dr. Heath. Dodd describes him as “a prudent prelate, with whom neither craft nor interest had any place.”

The Earl of BEDFORD comes next. Amongst those

who became wealthy by the rise and progress of the Reformation none were so remarkable as the Russells for their success in obtaining riches and their tenacity in amplifying and retaining them. Mr. Froude's portrait of the chief of that prudent *ilk* in those days does not lack interest. He says,—“Francis Russell, Earl of Bedford, was the favourite above all English noblemen with the extreme Reformers. In the late reign (Henry's) he was one of the few of high rank who had not cared to conceal his opinions, and although Queen Mary had not dared to proceed to extremities against him, he had been imprisoned and had been released only to go into voluntary exile. He had travelled into Italy, paying a visit by the way to the refugees at Zurich; and the Genevans flocked to him afterwards as their surest friend in Elizabeth's cabinet. In appearance he was a heavy, ungainly man, distinguished chiefly by the huge dimensions of his head. When Charles of Austria was a suitor for Elizabeth's hand, and questions were asked of his person, the Earl of Bedford's large head was the comparison made use of in his disparagement; but his expression, like that of Nicholas Bacon, was stern and powerful; the world, as he knew it, was no place for the softer virtues, and those only could play their parts there to good purpose, whose tempers were as hard as the age, and whose intellects had an edge of steel.” The reader has already seen the ensanguined career of Lord Russell under Somerset. None persecuted their former co-religionists with such intense bitterness as the Russells, whose love for the new religion was sincere in proportion to the wealth its profession obtained them. They hated Popery as they detested poverty, and their veneration of Protestantism about equalled

their greed of its worldly benefits. This family has always been an exemplification of the superiority in circumspect hands of tact over talent. Without genius or mental greatness, their members have made way to the highest offices; and whilst most of those enriched by the plunder of the Church squandered their gains in gaming and licentiousness, this thrifty family clung like leeches to their possessions, augmenting them step by step to a princely and colossal fortune. The personal likeness of the various members of the Russell family is remarkable. Two centuries ago they were described as *cunning little men with big heads.*

Amongst those who professed to cling to the Papal side, and displayed a more lengthened adhesion to Rome, were some of the worst men of the time. The Duke of Norfolk (at this epoch at least) and his son Surrey, Lord Arundel, the Marquis of Winchester, Lords Pembroke, Chandos, Paget, Petre, and Dr. Wotton, were time-servers who could reflect no honour on any cause which they adopted. Norfolk was one of the most obsequious of Henry's lay instruments. He, however, had some merits. As a general and as an Irish viceroy, he has not left the memory of great faults. In 1520, when Earl of Surrey, he went to Ireland as Lord Deputy, in which capacity Leland represents him as having acted "with an equity and moderation that disarmed all opposition." As a diplomatist he was less successful; as a general, once at least, signally victorious. At the battle of Flodden Field he was "three times unhorsed," and his life saved by the gallantry of Sir William Sidney. He did the State good service at home and abroad, which was subsequently so appreciated by his grateful sovereign that he was impeached and condemned to

death for assuming heraldic cognizances claimed as the exclusive privilege of royalty. He had many enemies amongst the Council and the Reformers towards the close of Henry's reign, as he was then considered the great champion of the Papal or Catholic party. In a letter to Henry VIII. the Duke defended himself against the secret whisperings of Cranmer and Hertford :—“I know not,” he said, “that I have offended any man, or that any one was offended with me, unless it were such as were angry with me for being quick against the Sacramentarians<sup>9</sup>. ” The correspondence of Bullinger occasionally shows the deep-rooted enmity the Reformers entertained to Norfolk, yet his most dangerous foes were men of his own creed, amongst whom was Stephen Gardiner. Their subsequent imprisonment in the Tower, however, having brought them together, peace and friendship reigned between the former rivals. The King's thirst for Norfolk's blood was intense, for his almost last words were, “Let Norfolk be in the hands of the executioner at six in the morning<sup>1</sup>. ” Four hours preceding that period the tyrant King was himself summoned to the bar of eternal justice. The Duke of Somerset declined shedding Norfolk's blood at the accession of young Edward, but consigned him to the Tower during that monarch's reign. Norfolk had, therefore, some claims upon the justice and generosity of Queen Mary, although he had been, in former years, the implacable enemy of her mother, and had also the baseness to set an example (improved on) to his son to outrage and insult the fallen Wolsey. When restored by Mary, Norfolk retaliated upon his enemies

<sup>9</sup> Lord Herbert's “Life of Henry VIII.,” p. 265.

<sup>1</sup> Leti, Herbert, Speed, Pomeroy.

with all his natural vindictiveness and in too common an agreement with the spirit of the age. As Lord High Steward he presided at the trial of his old enemy, John Dudley, Duke of Northumberland, and it seemed a somewhat strange coincidence that his father, forty-four years previously, took the leading part at the trial of Northumberland's father, who, in company with Empson, was condemned to the scaffold as a peculator of the national purse. Thus father and son sped the deaths of parent and offspring.

The Duke of Norfolk's antecedents could have won him as little sympathy from the Catholics as from the Reformers. There was scarcely a death by law or command, which occurred before his own arrest that he did not sanction as a minister of the Crown—the executions of the Carthusians, Bishop Fisher, Sir Thomas More, Anna Boleyn, Lord Cromwell and Katherine Howard, besides others of less note. The reader has already seen the fashion in which he exercised the “discretion of mercy,” in the case of the “Pilgrims of Grace.” In Henry’s time he was the most hostile man in England to the Pope’s supremacy; and in one of his letters he says:—“If I had twenty lives, I would rather have spent them all than that he should ever have any power in this realm.” Yet, at the same time he was opposed to the Reformation; and Archbishop Cranmer in Edward’s reign considered him the greatest and most powerful enemy the Reformers possessed amongst the prisoners then in the Tower. If the Duke of Norfolk was opposed to the Reformers in religion, he agreed with them as to the spoliation of Church property; and, like Sir Thomas Wriothesley, and other Catholics, he received his share of the monastic plunder

—several most valuable manors having been allotted to him. It would be idle to deny that a large number of the Catholic party were just as anxious to plunder the Church as the Reformers; but in subsequent times the “unsatisfied Reformers” seized upon the spoil which Henry conferred on those professing Catholics, fulfilling the adage—“Ill got, ill gone.” In Queen Mary’s reign the Duke of Norfolk’s career was brief, but effective. In the words of a contemporary, “the Queen restored the hero of Flodden Field to his place to take his vengeance, and—to die.” In the eighty-second year of his age, laying aside the warrior, the courtier, the statesman, and the proud baronial lord, Thomas, Duke of Norfolk, retired to the quiet shades of Framlington Castle, where he spent the close of an eventful life in acts of devotion and charity, and died in peace with the world—at least the world around him. The character of Norfolk was full of contrasts. His ancient lineage placed him above all the nobles of the land. Bearing a descent from Charlemagne down to the Plantagenets—brave as the heroes of antiquity, munificent and princely in social life, haughty to his rivals, and condescending to his inferiors, gallant and profuse, he was widely popular with a nation, who were proud of its public men, whilst winning the envy of the nobles, and the hatred of an ungrateful king.

The Earl of SURREY, whilst he bore a marked ill will to the Reformers, indifferently practised his own creed. History and tradition have been kind to Surrey. It is probable that his early death on the scaffold has imparted a halo to his memory which his actions would not have given. But, then, let us remember that the poet, the lover (as alleged) of the “beautcous Geraldine,”

on whose name have been produced many florid and baseless romances in prose and poem, ascended the scaffold in the forenoon of what promised to be a distinguished life. All the thought of England, not to mention its sympathy, concentrated around the block placed for the gifted young noble by the hands of a moribund tyrant. No marvel history has only preserved the best traits in the character of the Earl of Surrey<sup>2</sup>. His life was a mixture of the romantic and the beautiful, and the evil in his brief career was so much overbalanced by the better element that the name of Surrey presents itself to posterity like that kind of kaleidoscope in which the brightest colours always prevail. Terrible times, indeed, when duchesses and other titled dames of historic lineage appeared as voluntary witnesses against their husbands and their brothers; when the wife sustained the Crown prosecutor, and the “mistress confronted her for the defence.” The Duchess of Richmond’s evidence was tendered to slay her accomplished brother, Lord Surrey. Lady Rochford professed to give evidence of the commission of an abominable crime by her husband; and other women, of a higher social standing, were to be found secretly abetting the Star Chamber prosecutors of their nearest kindred. Family pride, human sympathy; that generosity of feeling which once characterized the English heart; the higher sentiments of equity and charity—all seemed to have been buried in the one grave in those evil days, which ushered in the conflict between the “old and the new learning.”

<sup>2</sup> In Nott’s “Life of the Earl of Surrey,” some interesting anecdotes are to be found in relation to the gifted poet and his “ladies-love.” It was at the residence of the ill-fated Queen (Catherine Howard) Surrey first met the “Faire Geraldine.”

POLYDORE VERGIL, whose real name was Ambrose Pier Castelli, was a native of Urbino, in Italy. He first came to England on the invitation of his kinsman Hadrian Castelli, who was appointed Bishop of Bath and Wells. Through Hadrian's interest he became prebendary of Wells, and several other livings were also conferred on him. He enjoyed the friendship of Richard Foxe, Bishop of Winchester, who, having a favourable opinion of his learning and judgment, introduced him to Henry VII. as a man competent to write a history of England, which he undertook, the King and his successor placing the public records and other documents of the State at his disposal. Polydore's history is written in Latin. Many distinguished writers have questioned the accuracy of the work, amongst whom were Leland, Bale, Sir Henry Saville, and Humphrey Lloyd. Those historians charge him with ignorance of the affairs of England, and a "wish to magnify to a certain extent the actions of other nations." He is also accused of having destroyed several records, lest there might be any evidence against him of having put forward false statements. He had, however, made himself extremely unpopular. Educated Englishmen, laymen, clerics, were indignant at their country being caricatured or cynically criticised by a foreigner who enjoyed lucrative livings in the English Church. At one time Polydore employed two persons for the purpose of writing lampoons on public men with whom he differed. He was particularly severe on his own order; indeed, it is difficult to say what party escaped his invective. His conduct to Wolsey proves him to be a most unworthy and vindictive person. Dr. Brewer traces all the falsehoods heaped by subsequent writers on the great

chancellor to the malicious slander of Vergil. Even the virtuous Fisher did not escape the dark venom of his malevolent pen. Henry VIII. entertained a high opinion of his learning and acuteness, conversing with him for hours upon ancient history. Some of his contemporaries considered him to be a cunning, miserly man, who always looked to his own interest and those of his relatives. Dodd states that “if keeping his pre-ferments be a rule to judge of his religion, he went all the lengths of the Court in Henry’s reign. But when Edward VI. ascended the throne his inclinations appeared otherwise<sup>3</sup>. He resigned his living to the crown, and asked permission to retire to Italy. To his petition the young king, or his government, returned the following answer:—

“Whereas our trusty and well-beloved friend Polydore Vergil hath made suite unto us, that he being born in sunny Italy, and having served our grandfather, Henry VII., and our own father Henry VIII. of blessed memory, and ourselves, for the space of forty years and more, we now declare and decree that the said Polydore Vergil hath our full license and pleasure to depart out of this realm, and to enjoy all the profits and monies which were conferred on him through livings by our grandfather and father.”

(Signed) EDWARD, REX.

Polydore Vergil lived to be ninety-three years old, and died at Urbino in 1555. He was the last official collector of Peter’s pence who was recognized by the Government of England.

Peter’s pence, as an annual offering from the people of England to the Pope, was commenced by Ina, King of the West Saxons, about A.D. 720, and continued under all the English sovereigns down to Henry VIII. It was first granted for the support of the English who

<sup>3</sup> Dodd’s “Church History,” vol. i. p. 325.

made pilgrimages to the Eternal City ; houses of entertainment of two classes were erected for them, also a college, an hospital, and several libraries. The grants were sustained by the kings of England, "with the lasting incense of gratitude to Rome for the blessings she conferred on their country." In process of time a portion of those funds were appropriated to other purposes, and the Papal Treasury itself received large sums from England, which were bestowed with no niggard hand. The method of collecting was a penny from each family annually, but some persons sent "shillings to the fund." In the reign of Henry III. John Willie, a merchant of London, contributed five pounds to Peter's pence ; and in the reign of Henry V. William Wolci, another merchant, subscribed ten pounds. Whittington, the munificent Lord Mayor, contributed twenty pounds ; and in the reign of Edward IV. William Caxton, our first English printer, made an offering of sixty shillings to Peter's pence. Caxton's patron and friend, the chivalrous Marquis of Worcester, was likewise a liberal contributor to this fund<sup>4</sup>. As the population increased in numbers and wealth, Peter's pence became a large annual tribute to the Pontiff. Simon Fish stated that the contribution amounted to 4000*l.* per annum in Henry VIII.'s time ; but the fact of Fish alleging it is an excellent reason for not believing it ; for he was, if possible, more mendacious than Foxe or Bale. The sum, however, was considerable.

Dr. NICHOLAS WOTTON was another specimen of the pliant and self-adapting politicians of those days. He

<sup>4</sup> The Marquis of Worcester was beheaded by Edward IV., upon which Caxton remarked, "Alas ! alas ! a head has been cut off which contained more knowledge than all the lords' heads in the realm."

was ambassador in Paris during Henry's reign, and subsequently held office under all the "contending parties." He was engaged in thirteen diplomatic missions from England to foreign Courts. He was one of the few who said a kind word to Anna Boleyn at the time of her fall, and had the courage to visit her in the Tower. At times he enjoyed the confidence of Cranmer, of Somerset, and of Gardiner. In 1549 he joined Warwick's party against Somerset, and received a Secretaryship of State as his reward. The Reformers thought him honest, and the Catholics concurred in their opinion—a pretty good sign that he was of passing integrity. Mr. Tytler remarks that "it is no easy matter to ascertain what were the real principles, political or religious, held by such a man. Doubtless the difficulty lies in the fact of there being no principle to discover." It is a pity to be too hard upon the flexible in perilous times. In an age abounding in chameleon statesmen<sup>5</sup>, Wotton caught and changed colour so dexterously that he appears a very Proteus amongst the mutables. If he did not commit himself in his changings, he deserves credit for his ingenuity. He has been quaintly denominated by one author "the very measure of incongruity;" by another, "a centre of remarkables;" so far the description is correct, which states that he adapted himself to every Government, and continued to flourish under every change. The Protector's disgrace only raised him higher under Warwick; Warwick's fall led directly to his promotion under

<sup>5</sup> In Dr. Brandon's "Anecdotes of Men of Qualitie and Wit," printed in Brussels A.D. 1572, appear some curious narratives of the public men of Henry VIII.'s reign. Also Fuller's "Worthios," Lascelle's "Letters" (blaek letter), and Froude.

Mary ; and her great favour to him appears to have been no barrier to his being thrown into the most difficult and responsible offices by Elizabeth. “Tempora mutantur, et Wotton cum illis.” (He was fit for the times). An author of the last century (Lloyd) presents what Tytler styles a “satirical panegyric” on Dr. Wotton—“This was that rare man that was made for all business—so dexterous ! This was he that was made for all times—so complying ! This was he who lived Doctor of both laws, and *died Doctor of both Gospels.*”

SIR WILLIAM CECIL held an appointment under Somerset, and when that minister was impeached by the Warwick party, he deserted his friend, and took office under the newly created Duke of Northumberland. Between Cranmer and Cecil there existed “a private compact” for promoting the Reformation in Edward’s reign<sup>6</sup>. Cecil at that period was in constant communication with the German Reformers ; he was likewise the medium through which Cranmer offered terms to the “dishonest or wavering” secular clergy to join the Reformers. When Northumberland set aside the claims of the Royal sisters to the throne, Cecil joined him. When Pembroke, Winchester, and Paget abandoned Lady Jane’s cause, Sir William imitated their example. He next appears before Queen Mary at Ipswich with despatches from the Council ; he excuses himself for his treason on the ground of “timidity, and want of experience in such matters ;” he gives the Queen a list of his “excuses<sup>7</sup> ;” he procures the intercession of the

<sup>6</sup> Strype’s “Cranmer,” vol. i. p. 408.

<sup>7</sup> To form an estimate of Sir William Cecil’s conduct and “probity” at this period the reader is referred to Tytler’s “Edward and Mary,” vol. ii. first edition, pp. 169—447.

ladies of the court ; and so far satisfies his Sovereign, that she exclaims to Dame Bacon, “ Maister Cecil is a very honest man.” He kissed the Queen’s hand before any member of the new Council appeared before her. And, although he expressed his desire to immediately return to Catholicity, he received no office in the Government. He returned to the “ faith of his fathers ;” he went to confession, and received Holy Communion ; he exhorted his retainers and relatives to do the same ; he was present in the Commons when a petition to the Pope was agreed upon, praying his Holiness “ to receive England again into the bosom of the Church.” He was one of the deputation who went to Dover to welcome Cardinal Pole to England ; when King Philip arrived at Southampton, Cecil was among the courtier-Catholics to welcome him ; when Philip and Mary went to St. Paul’s, Cecil sat beside Lord Pembroke, and was conspicuous for his apparent piety ; he lost no opportunity of displaying his devotion to Catholicity ; when his old friend Cranmer lay in the Tower he deserted him ; when the trial of the Archbishop took place at Guildhall and at Oxford, he never raised his voice for mercy ; he was only to be found on the strongest side. When Mary’s days were drawing to a close he was in constant communication with the Royal lady who resided at Hatfield, and ready to “ salute the rising sun ” the moment Mary was dead<sup>8</sup>. Isaac Bannister, an Anabaptist preacher, describes Cecil, in the early part of Elizabeth’s reign, as “ becoming rich by taking his neighbour’s goods,” and he adds with bitter truth, that “ he went to his half-Popish devotions four times a day, thus en-

<sup>8</sup> Lingard, vols. v. vi., “ Queens of England,” vols. v. vi. vii. ; also Froude’s “ Elizabeth.”

deavouring to make heaven an accomplice in his hypocrisy, and to compound with God in private for his crimes in public.” The long dark history of this notable as Sir William Cecil and subsequently Lord Burleigh, belongs to the reign of Elizabeth.

## QUEEN MARY AND HER PARLIAMENT.

PUBLIC attention was next turned to Queen Mary’s coronation, which took place on the 1st of October. Three days before the ceremony the Queen removed from St. James’s to Whitehall, and took her “barge at the stairs,” accompanied by her sister Elizabeth, and a number of ladies, and proceeded to the Tower, where “great feasting and rejoicing” continued for two days.

The Queen created fifteen knights, amongst whom were her kinsman, Courteney, Earl of Devonshire, and the young Earl of Surrey. The public procession to the City presented a grand appearance, and was remarkable for the immense number of women of all ranks and station who attended it. The Queen headed the procession of ladies, seated in a litter drawn by six white horses, covered with housings of cloth of silver. Her Highness was dressed in a gown of velvet trimmed with ermine. On her head was a caul of gold network, studded with pearls and precious stones. The Princess Elizabeth came next in an open chariot, covered with crimson velvet; Anne of Cleves was seated beside “the golden Eliza;” they were both dressed in robes of cloth of silver, with large hanging sleeves. Then followed some three hundred ladies on horseback, with “elegant appointments.” Music and incense greeted the procession along its route, and the acclamations of the people were loud and frequent. In Fenchurch-street four

giants, dressed in antique costume, made congratulatory speeches to the Queen; in Gracechurch-street the Florentine merchants presented “an angel dressed in green, and standing on a triumphal arch; when the angel lifted its gigantic arm with the trumpet to its mouth, the people emitted a shout of astonishment.” The conduits at Cornhill and Cheapside ran with wine, and the foreigners present were astonished at the “fine clothing and luxuries” displayed by the citizens of London. In Cheapside the City Merchants presented their Sovereign with “a benevolence” of one thousand marks in a crimson purse; at St. Paul’s, the Queen’s poet and musician, Heywood, sat under an old vine and delivered an eloquent welcome to his Royal mistress.

On the day of the coronation, Elizabeth walked a little behind the Queen, and Anne of Cleves followed. Elizabeth received all the honours due to her station. “It has been very seldom,” writes Miss Strickland, “that either heir or heiress presumptive to the throne occupied a place of such distinction in a coronation.” Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, assisted by ten prelates, performed the ceremony, according to the old Catholic ritual. Holgate and Cranmer, the Archbishops of York and Canterbury, were then prisoners in the Tower; but during the coronation festivities they had “perfect liberty to go in and out,” and Cranmer was actually absent for three days, and returned again to prison. Foxe and Dr. Sandys concur in the truth of this statement. Gardiner’s secretary expressed his surprise at the Archbishop’s return. “My maister,” said he, “thought the Lord Cranmer was in Germany by this time.” Cranmer seemed to be ignorant of, or not to regard, the power of his enemies. At the grand

banquet which followed the coronation, the Duke of Norfolk, according to olden custom, "ushered in the first course on horseback," accompanied by the Earl of Derby, as Lord High Steward of England. At this entertainment Elizabeth was also treated with marked attention by the Queen. Anne of Cleves, who was popular with the people, was likewise present.

Four days subsequent to the coronation festivities the Queen opened her first Parliament, when nearly every statute passed in the reign of Edward VI., against the olden religion, was repealed; as were also the cruel laws of Henry VIII.'s reign. Some useful laws were likewise passed for regulating trade and commerce. This Parliament of Mary restored the Church to the position in which it stood at the death of Henry—"Catholic, but still anti-Papal,"—with the Queen reluctantly holding the headship, on the advice of Gardiner, who had not yet made up his mind to be reconciled to the Pope<sup>9</sup>. Whilst Mary held this position, be it remembered, no one suffered persecution "for religious opinions" in England; those terrible scenes did not take place until her Highness relinquished all claim to be "head of the Church," declaring that "the Pope alone was Christ's Vicar."

On the 6th of December the Queen came down to the Parliament and gave her consent to thirty-one new Acts, her Highness touching each statute with her sceptre<sup>10</sup>. Queen Anne was the last English sovereign who performed this ceremony.

When the Queen gave her assent to the bills passed by Parliament, it was approaching Christmas, and she

<sup>9</sup> Dodd's "Church History," vol. i.

<sup>10</sup> "Parliamentary Hist.," vol. iii. p. 332.

told all parties to “go their ways home, to honour the season as English Catholics hitherto did, to give large hospitality, and not to forget the claims of the poor and the ailing upon their bounty.” At this time the calm still continued; but plots of a formidable character were being hatched. Sir Thomas Wyatt and Courtney’s names were associated with one party in Kent, who were supposed to be in favour of the Princess Elizabeth; whilst the Duke of Suffolk, who had been so recently pardoned, and his unfortunate daughter still in the Tower, convicted of high treason, was again making secret movements in favour of her claims to the throne.

“If Mary’s Parliaments,” writes Miss Strickland, “had been as honest as herself, her reign would have been the pride of the country, instead of its reproach; because, if they had done their duty in guarding their fellow-creatures from bloody penal laws regarding religion, Queen Mary, by her first regal act, in restoring the ancient free constitution of the Plantagenets, had put it out of the power of her own Government to take furtive vengeance on any individual who opposed it. She had exerted all the energy of her great eloquence to impress on the minds of her judges, that they were to act as independent umpires between herself and her people. She had no standing army to awe Parliament, no riches to bribe them. . . . Her personal expenditure was extremely economical, and she successfully struggled with poverty till her husband had almost involved the country in a war with France<sup>1</sup>. As already remarked, the great majority of Mary’s Parliament—Peers and Commons—were as dishonest and corrupt as those who preceded them in the two previous reigns.

<sup>1</sup> “Queens of England,” vol. v. p. 411.

They were indifferent to all religions, and willing to establish any creed, or have no creed, so that they might retain the plunder they had obtained. Miss Strickland declares that the House of Lords, who in Mary's reign legalised the horrible persecutions of the Reformers, were the very same individuals who had planted so recently the Protestant Church in England. The reign of Henry VIII. corrupted all, high and low, and inoculated the temperament of men in power with a ferocity hitherto unknown to the English character. The few who composed the House of Lords were thoroughly debased. Many of the ancient nobility, who advised or controlled the Sovereign in former times, were cut off by Henry VIII., and their places filled up by the political servants and mere creatures of the King; needy, mean, dishonourable, and of low extraction; men whose fathers had been mace-bearers to judges, mayors of London, silk mercers, usurers, dicing knights, lawyers without a character or a shade of conscience, country squires who were raised to the peerage for marrying the mistresses of the King or his ministers; together with those men who became landed proprietors through the plunder of the Church. Such were the notabilities who composed the English House of Peers in Mary's reign, making not more than fifty-four.

## THE REFORMATION IN IRELAND.

The men who first broached the Reformation in Ireland were three of the worst English priests—Browne, Archbishop of Dublin, Staples, Bishop of Meath, and Bale, Bishop of Ossory. Archbishop Browne had originally been Cranmer's private secretary, and in this

position became acquainted with Lord Cromwell and King Henry. He was then, we have read, "saintly and pious," but when the monastic confiscation and supremacy questions were discussed he gave the King and Cranmer "the benefit of his advice." Cranmer could not have informed the King as to the real character of his friend, whom he, no doubt justly, regarded as virtuous as himself. Upon Cranmer's recommendation the King appointed Browne Archbishop of Dublin, and he was "consecrated" for that office by Cranmer in March, 1535. The correspondence of Dr. Browne with the King and Lord Cromwell prove that he was determined to carry out his Sovereign's policy in Church matters; but the Irish priests and the "Catholics of the Pale crossed him at every path."<sup>2</sup> The description furnished of themselves by the three prelates above-named, and the picture of their clergy drawn by their own hands are not very edifying<sup>2</sup>. Dr. Browne accuses the Bishop of Meath of "divers irregularities." He finds fault with his sermons. "I think," writes Browne, "that his lordship of Meath—that three-mouthed Cerberus of hell—could not have uttered any thing more viperously." Whilst celebrating Mass, Staples had a wife and several children. Dr. Bale complains bitterly of the "bad conduct of the Archbishop of Dublin." In 1553 Bale writes in a "moment of unconscious virtue,"

<sup>2</sup> In the report of a Commission of Enquiry issued in 1538, "On Irish Affairs," Dr. Browne's clergy are accused of extortions for baptisms and marriages, also of not officiating at appointed times. They were further charged with "taking wives and dispensing with the sacrament of marriage altogether." This Report horrified Henry VIII. as to the character of the men "whom Cranmer sent to Ireland as priests." The Archbishop pacified his master, and things remained as before.

of the “evil life” and “bad example” of his Grace of Dublin, and excuses the corruption of his own clergy<sup>3</sup> in Ossory by stating that “they would not obey, alleging for their excuse the lewd example of the Archbishop of Dublin, who was always slack in things pertaining to God’s glory.” Bale thus proceeds with his description of Browne:—“He was an epicurious archbishop, a dissembling proselyte, a brockish swine, a glutton, a drunkard, a hypocrite, a frequent supporter of bawds, and ——<sup>4</sup>.” Curwin, the successor of Archbishop Browne, was, if possible, a far worse man. In Queen Mary’s reign, Bale fled from Kilkenny before the Queen had time to supersede him. He was detested and despised in the diocese of Ossory, and his life was several times in danger. The Irish people never could tolerate licentious preachers of any religion. He repaired to Switzerland, where he remained until the accession of Elizabeth, but never desired to return to Ireland. He was more content to accept the inferior office of a prebendary in Canterbury; and Archbishop Parker, his canons, and clergy, seemed to feel no access of honour in becoming associated with the fallen Bishop of Ossory, whom Mr. Froude indignantly denounces as “a foul-mouthed ruffian,” and in another chapter describes him as the “most profane and indecent of the movement party<sup>5</sup>. ” Bale had been twice imprisoned in London and York for preaching

<sup>3</sup> The clerics alluded to by Bale were not Irishmen, but a selection from Archbishop Cranmer’s “spiritual sheep walk” in the diocese of Canterbury.

<sup>4</sup> Bale’s “Letter to Poynet;” “Letters from Ireland;” Irish State Papers.

<sup>5</sup> Froude’s “History of England,” vol. v. p. 58.

“ sedition and disturbing the public mind.” He died in 1563, in his 68th year. Amongst his numerous works, the most interesting is a book in Latin, giving an account of all the learned men and writers of distinction that England had produced. Hales, the preacher, states that Dr. Bale was unhappy in his latter days. “ He seemed,” writes Hales, “ uneasy in conscience. I told him to search the Scriptures, where he would find comfort, when he said, ‘ he wished he had searched them less.’ He spoke other words which showed me plainly he had become a ‘ troubled spirit,’ and was likely to die in that condition.”

Whilst in England professing Catholics, induced most probably by political and financial causes, persecuted the Reformers, a far different mode of procedure was taken in Ireland. A Low Church writer some time since deplored that “ unfortunately there were no martyrs in the Irish Church.” The simple reason is that no such Church, as a congregation of believers in it, existed. The Protestants in Ireland, called a Church for the purpose of confiscation and injustice, consisted merely of English officials and the hangers-on of the Viceroy and his semi-military court. In Ireland the re-establishment of the old religion under Mary was effected without violence. No persecution of the small Protestant colony was attempted, and several of the English Reformers who fled from the zeal of the inquisitors at home, found a safe retreat among the Catholics of Ireland. “ It is but justice to this maligned body,” writes Dr. Taylor, “ to acknowledge that on the three occasions of their obtaining the upper hand the Irish Catholics never injured a single person in life or limb for professing a religion different from their own. They had

suffered persecutions and learned mercy, as they showed in the reign of Mary, in the wars from 1641 to 1648, and during the brief reign of James the Second<sup>6</sup>. Dr. Leland, another Protestant historian, bears similar evidence as to the conduct of the Irish Catholics towards the Reformers. "Those Reformers who went to Ireland," observes Leland, "there enjoyed their opinions and worship in privacy, without notice or molestation<sup>7</sup>."

The religious orders and the secular clergy in Ireland were zealous in preaching and instructing the people at this period. They of course denounced the newly introduced doctrines, but they were opposed to violence and persecution, declaring that the principles of the Catholic Church were those of kindness, persuasion, and charity. The Dominicans were the most remarkable body of clerics in Ireland for centuries<sup>8</sup>. They were

<sup>6</sup> Taylor's "History of the Civil Wars of Ireland," vol. i. p. 169.

<sup>7</sup> Leland's "History of Ireland," book iii. p. 18.

<sup>8</sup> In the olden time the Irish Dominican Order was highly esteemed by the Church. In 670 years, 92 Dominicans were consecrated bishops; 10 for foreign countries, and 82 for Ireland. 10 Dominicans became primates of Armagh; 4, Archbishops of Tuam; 3, Archbishops of Dublin, and 1, Archbishop of Cashel. The two first Dominicans who became Archbishops of Dublin were Englishmen "of the Pale," namely, John de Derlington, 1271; William de Hothun, in 1297; and the last, John Thomas Troy, translated from Ossory in 1787, as the successor of Dr. Carpenter. For thirty-six years Dr. Troy presided over the Archdiocese of Dublin. He died in 1823. At the time of his death he was worth about *ten-pence*. This incident must have been the topic of conversation in the high circles of England, when it is noted in Thomas Moore's Diary (vol. iv. p. 117). Some time previous, the Anglican Archbishop of Armagh bequeathed (not to the poor of the diocese) the sum of 130,000*l.* to his relatives. And such was the thoughtful kindness of the venerable prelate, that he did not forget his *huntsman*. To return to the Dominicans. The two first bishops of New York were of this illustrious Order, namely, Coneannon and Connolly. It is also a remarkable fact, that every diocese in Ireland had a Dominican as a Bishop except Clogher.

the “Good shepherds who guarded the sheep by day and by night.” On the more open introduction of the Reformation in Edward’s reign and that of Elizabeth, neither fatigue, danger, nor the fear of the dungeon could intimidate or awe those good men. In Mary’s reign they gave “protection, food, and lodging to numbers of the English Reformers, telling the people to treat them with kindness, and pray that God might turn them from the error of their way<sup>9</sup>.” Many of those exiles settled in Dublin, Drogheda, and other towns, and became the founders of large mercantile communities of subsequent periods. What a return the Irish Catholics received for their humanity and charity from their English neighbours is on record. The reign of Elizabeth, especially, forms one of the darkest pages in the history of English rule in Ireland. It stands forth without a parallel in the annals of civilization. It is a history traced in blood, and blotted with the tears of the most generous and forgiving people in the world.

Edmund Spenser, who had a personal knowledge of Ireland, having obtained a large confiscated estate in the county Cork, and aided in rocking Protestantism in its Irish cradle, thus writes of the Irish bishops a few years later:—“Some of the bishops whose dioceses are in remote parts somewhat out of the world’s eye, doe not at all bistowe the benefices which are in their own donation, upon any, but keepe them in their owne hands, and set their owne servants and horse-boys to take up the tithes and fruites of them ; with the which, some of them purchase great lands, and build faire

<sup>9</sup> Letters of the Rev. Roger O’Shaughnessy “On the Dominican Fathers and the English Reformers.” Printed in Brussels, A.D. 1601.

castells upon the same. Of which abuse, if any question be moved, they have a very seemly colour and excuse, that they have no worthy ministers to bestowe them upon<sup>1</sup>.” Thus the bishops, we see, had but few ministers, the ministers no flocks. In fact, so far as Protestantism was concerned in propagating its tenets in Ireland, it exactly accorded with an Irish writer’s quaint definition of nothing—“a footless stocking without a leg.” Spenser, after disposing of the prelacy, comments upon the merits of the clergy. He observes:—“Whatever disorders you see in the Church of England, you finde there (Ireland), and many more. Namely, gross simony, greedy covetousness, fleshly incontinence, careless sloath, and generally all disordered life in the common clergymen<sup>2</sup>.” Be it remembered that the men so described were ordained and inducted by those who were the “Fathers of the Reformation,” that they were all Englishmen, which fact, not to talk of the absence of virtue, might alone prove a good excuse at that time for the “benighted Irish” having nothing to do with the new faith. Carte, an Anglican ecclesiastic, writing of a later date, corroborates the statements of Edmund Spenser. “The clergy of the Established Church were generally ignorant and unlearned, loose and irregular in their lives and conversations, negligent of their cures, and very careless of observing uniformity and decency in divine worship.” “I loathe and abhor those Popish priests,” was the observation of Spenser; yet he has drawn this contrast between the clergy of the olden creed and those of the new one, as he witnessed them in Ireland:—“It is greate wonder to see the oddes which is betweene the zeale of Popish priests and the

<sup>1</sup> Spenser, p. 140.<sup>2</sup> Ibid. p. 139.

ministers of the Gospel, for they spare not to come out of Spayne, from Rome, and from Remes by long toile is dangerous travailing hither, where they know perill of deathe awayteth them, and no reward or riches is to be found, only to draw the people into the Church of Rome ; whereas some of our idle ministers, having a way for credit and estimation thereby opened unto them, and having the livings of the country offered to them, without paines and without perill, will neither for the same, nor any love of God, nor zeale for religion, or for all the good they may doe by winning soules to God, be drawne forth from their warm nests to looke out into God's harvest <sup>3.</sup>"

Godwin, the Puritan writer on the Commonwealth, describes the "Mass priests" of Ireland in the hour of persecution as disinterested and fearless in sustaining their wretched flocks and upholding their religion. "In the hour of their trial," he says, "they stood forth superior to human infirmity ; with resolution inflexible they encountered every possible calamity, suffered the utmost hardships and privations, and counted nothing worthy of their attention but the glory of God and the salvation of souls<sup>4.</sup>" Sir William Petty has drawn a terrible picture of the condition of affairs in Ireland in those days; and Lord Clarendon affirms that it "could only be surpassed by the destruction of the Jews by Titus."

It has long been the fate of Ireland to be misrepresented in its people, its history, its religion, and its social condition. It must be an irksome task for the apologists of an enduring mistake, like English government in Ireland, to endeavour to make out a conscientious reason, apart from the true one, for the state of

<sup>3</sup> Spenser, p. 254.

<sup>4</sup> Godwin's "Commonwealth."

that country ; but the greatest misapprehension extant is the belief that the creed which the advisers of Elizabeth would force upon the unwilling people of Ireland was simply that which existed before the Norman invasion. Many eminent writers have stated that Elizabeth did not abolish the ancient Church of Ireland, but merely removed the “abuses of Rome, its priesthood, and their superstitions.” A sense of justice compels the observation that the writers who make the foregoing statement have been singularly inconclusive in their deductions. No amount of honest research has yet proved that the Irish in the sixteenth century were not as devoted to the belief of Rome as their fathers, who more than a thousand years before had journeyed through the forest beneath the starlight<sup>5</sup>, to visit at rise of sun those lone shrines and holy wells sacred to the saints and sages of their faith. No change can research find between the religion professed after the Reformation and that cherished by “The Red Branch Knights,”—the same as that held by the envoys of literature whom Ireland sent to the Court of Charlemagne to illuminate Germany, Hungary, and Italy, or confound the syllogists of Paris—the same as that bled for by the true men whom the most famous of a long-descended line of kings led to victory at Clontarf. The Irish Celts, under their olden monarchs, professed the same creed as the English, Saxon, and Norman did under Alfred and the Plantagenets. The Reformation in Ireland was more a political revolution, accompanied by its equivalent confiscation, than a religious change<sup>6</sup>; and,

<sup>5</sup> The ancient Irish generally commenced their pilgrimages on nights when the moon or stars shone brightest.

<sup>6</sup> The reader will find in an eminent Protestant clergyman’s (Dr.

from the temper of the times and the social condition of the country, was doubly distasteful to the Irish people—antagonistic to a long-cherished belief as well as hostile to their temporal interests. The last boon a conquered land will receive at the hands of its victors is their creed. The religion of the olden race of Ireland has been written imperishably on the national heart—written in a long-derived and pitiable history; and even perverse inquiry is unable to impeach its immutability. The mixture of temporal and eternal interests has not only intensified the Anglo-Irish contest, but it has also imparted to it much of its melancholy interest, enabling its historians—by exhibiting the struggles of energy against wrong, depicting the transient sunshine of success amidst the darkness and sorrow of perennial discontent, and now and again displaying the elements of hope—to weave a rainbow even over that valley of tears.

---

#### THE ROYAL SISTERS.

WITH the death of Edward commenced the political career of Elizabeth. The sympathy extended to her sufferings during her sister's reign must, however, vanish before a rigid examination of facts. She undoubtedly acted with consummate tact, and with the duplicity for which she was noted, even at that early age. That she was deceived, and used by many of her own

Brady's) "Marian Bishops," and his other works bearing on the Irish Church, that we may fully dispense with the task of proving the silly falsehood and ignorance of the statement, that the Irish Church was ever any thing but Roman Catholic, in communion from the first with the See of Peter.

party was certain ; that she was implicated with Wyatt, Courtenay, and other traitors, there is also some evidence, direct and indirect, sufficient *then* to prove treason against her, and for a tenth part of which directed against herself she would have sent the offender to the block. One of the ablest of Elizabeth's biographers make the admission that her sister had every reason to doubt her loyalty. The Government of Mary intercepted two notes addressed to Elizabeth by Wyatt. In the first of these documents he tells her to remove at once to Donnington, which was in the vicinity of his head-quarters ; in the next note he again "urges her to action." Three despatches of Noailles to the French Government had been intercepted and deciphered, which revealed all the plans of the conspirators. Noailles, the French ambassador, had married one of Elizabeth's maids of honour ; which circumstance, of course, afforded a facility for more familiar intercourse than otherwise could have publicly taken place between the disaffected heiress of the Crown and the representative of a foreign Power. In addition to these presumptive evidences, a letter, supposed to have been written by her to the King of France, had fallen into the hands of the Queen. The Duke of Suffolk, doubtless with a view to the preservation of his own daughter, Lady Jane Dudley, had declared that the object of the conspiracy was the dethronement of the Queen, and the elevation of Elizabeth to her place. Wyatt acknowledged that he had written more than one letter to Elizabeth, and charged Courtenay, face to face, with having first suggested the rebellion. Sir James Crofts confessed "that he had conferred with Elizabeth, and solicited her to retire to Donnington ;" Lord Russell,

“that he had privately conveyed letters to her from Wyatt;” and another prisoner, “that he had been privy to a correspondence between Carew and Courtenay respecting the intended marriage of that nobleman and the princess.”

“In short,” says Miss Strickland, “a more disgusting series of treachery and cowardice never was exhibited than on this occasion; and if it be true that there is honesty among dishonest—that is to say, an observance of good faith towards each other in time of peril—it is certain nothing of the kind was to be found among these confederates, who respectively endeavoured, by the denunciation of their associates, to shift the penalty of their mutual offences to their fellows in misfortunes.”

Wyatt’s first confession was, “that the Sieur D’Oysell, when he passed through England into Scotland with the French ambassador to that country, spoke to Sir James Crofts to persuade him to prevent the marriage of Queen Mary with the heir of Spain; to raise Elizabeth to the throne, marry her to Courtenay, and put the Queen to death.” He also confessed the promised aid that was guaranteed by the King of France to the confederates, and the projected invasions from France and Scotland<sup>7</sup>.

“We have this morning,” writes Mr. Secretary Bourne to the Council, “travailed with Sir Thomas Wyatt, touching the Lady Elizabeth and her servant, Sir William Saintlow; and your lordship shall understand that Wyatt affirmeth his former sayings,” (a sworn statement he had made), “and says further, that Sir James Crofts knoweth more, if he be sent for and examined. Whereupon, Crofts has been called before us and examined, and confesseth with Wyatt, charging Saintlow with like matter, and further as we shall declare unto your said lordships. Wherefore, under your correction, we think necessary, and beseech you to send for Mr. Saintlow, and to examine him, or cause him to be sent hither, by us to be examined. Crofts is plain, and will tell all.”

<sup>7</sup> Burnet, Foxe, Griffet; Kempe’s Loseby MSS.; Lingard’s “Elizabeth;” Renaud’s “Letters to Charles V.;” Mackintosh, Tytler, Miss Strickland’s “Queens of England,” vol. v.

The Spanish Ambassador, in his report to the Emperor, dated March 1st, affirms that Crofts had confessed the truth in a written deposition, and admitted in plain terms the intrigues of the French Ambassador with the “heretics and rebels;” but this deposition has been vainly sought for at the State Paper Office<sup>8</sup>.

Elizabeth showed a firm front when Gardiner and the Lords of the Council waited on her—it may have been on the part of Gardiner to entrap her—on the part of Mary to seek a reason for the punishment already inflicted; for, although Mary had reason to know her sister’s desire to see her overthrown, the worst enemy of Mary cannot accuse her of ever agreeing to anything harsher than a brief incarceration and a menace to change the succession. On this occasion Elizabeth said to the bishop and his compeers:—

“ My lords, I am glad to see yon, for methinks I have been kept a great while from you, desolately alone. Wherefore I would entreat you to be a means to the King’s and Queen’s Majesties, that I may be delivered from my imprisonment, in which I have been kept a long time, as to you, my lords, is not unknown.”

Gardiner, in reply, told her “ she must then confess her fault, and put herself on the Queen’s mercy.” She replied, “ that rather than she would do so, she would lie in prison all her life; that she had never offended against the Queen in thought, word, or deed; that she craved no mercy at her Majesty’s hand, but rather desired to put herself on the law.”

The next day Gardiner and his colleagues came to her again, and Gardiner told her on his knee “ that the Queen marvelled at her boldness in refusing to confess

<sup>8</sup> State Papers Dom. of Mary’s reign.

her offence, so that it might seem as if her Majesty had wrongfully imprisoned her grace." "Nay," replied Elizabeth, "she may, if it please her, punish me as she thinketh good."

"Her Majesty willeth me to tell you," retorted Gardiner, "that you must tell another tale ere that you are set at liberty." Elizabeth replied "that she had as lief lie in prison with honesty, as to be abroad suspected of her Majesty;" adding, "that which I have said I will stand to."

"Then," said Gardiner, "your grace hath the vantage of me and these lords, for your long and wrongful imprisonment."

"What advantage I have you know," replied Elizabeth; "I seek no vantage at your hands for your so dealing with me—but God forgive you and me also."

They then, finding no concessions were to be obtained from her, withdrew, and Elizabeth was left in close confinement for a week, at the end of which time she was startled by receiving a summons to the Queen's presence one night, at ten o'clock. Imagining herself in great danger, she bade her attendants "pray for her, for she could not tell whether she should ever see them again."

Charles V. demanded the "immediate execution of Elizabeth." Her danger was great, and proceeded as much from her friends' indiscretion as from the hatred of her enemies. Every one who disliked the Queen's measures used her sister's name<sup>9</sup>. The sequel of the investigations, however, proved the magnanimity of the Queen, when she pardoned her sister against the consent

<sup>9</sup> Froude's "History of England," vol. vi. p. 94.

of her ministers<sup>1</sup>. Elizabeth's policy at this time was to appear neutral, and be prepared to join the strongest, or triumphant party.

Mary returned to Courtenay his patrimonial estates, which the forfeiture of his father had vested in the Crown, and restored to him the title of Earl of Devonshire, which had been so long hereditary in his illustrious house. But Mary did not this from personal love to her prepossessing kinsman. She knew that both herself and he had been persecuted for incidents connected with birth and creed; yet it is more than probable that, but for Gardiner, Courtenay would have fed the worms of the Tower garden, instead of romance making him "the beloved of the two royal sisters."

That these ideas entered people's heads in an isolated degree there is no invincible barrier to our present belief, but it is annoying to the student of history to have the *suggestio falsi* supplied by reckless novelistic suppositions.

The story of Courtenay's life has been overlaid with romance. Mary no more admired him than any other of her courtiers. She restored to him his ancestral property, and one of the first uses he made of his gifts was to attempt to overthrow his benefactress. If he loved Elizabeth, he only manifested his taste—for a most alluring princess she was—but Elizabeth always swore she knew not Courtenay as friend or lover; and, although she may have liked his alleged efforts to make her Queen, she did not trust him. Perhaps her hesitation in giving full countenance to Courtenay's plots was owing to his uncertain character. He was too

<sup>1</sup> Tytler's "Edward and Mary," vol. ii. pp. 311, 312.

cowardly to embark in any enterprise of hazard or danger, too incapable for an intricate one, and his weak humour made men afraid to trust themselves to one who, to save himself, might at any moment betray them. Noailles, in writing to his royal master, assures him that, were Courtenay anything but what he was, his success would be certain.

A lively scene occurred between the Queen and Gardiner when the latter advised her to marry Courtenay. "I had known him in the Tower," says Gardiner, "and I am well inclined towards him." The Queen replied like a Tudor. "My Lord of Winchester, is your having known Courtenay, Earl of Devonshire, in the Tower, a reason why you should think him a fitting husband for the Queen of this realm? I will not marry that young man; no, never. My lord, I am a woman to my word; what I say I do."<sup>2</sup> This short address was spoken in that deep, manlike voice which was peculiar to the Queen. Gardiner sobbed and cried, and expressed his desire to be obedient to his royal mistress.

The Commons having sent a deputation to the Queen, suggesting a marriage with a subject—which subject was undoubtedly Courtenay—she replied with energy. She assured the Speaker "that she would not marry any man whom she could not love, as it would put her in the grave in three months; she would willingly make any sacrifice for the welfare of her country and her people, but at the same time she believed that Englishmen were possessed of too much generosity and chivalry to ask their Queen to wed a man whom she could not love as a husband." Montague told Petre

<sup>2</sup> Renaud's "Despatches;" "Queens of England," vol. v.; Froude, vol. vi.

that but a few days before this incident the Queen received Philip's miniature from the Spanish minister, and Jane Dormer affirms that she saw "Queen Mary kiss it divers times," so that it would appear as if the prudish Mary was in love with Philip ere she saw him. Court gossip would have her Highness as susceptible of the tender passion as her sister Elizabeth. Mary, however, loved from principle and sentiment, whilst the "Golden Eliza" loved the sweet flirtation to which that sentiment gave rise.

It has been stated that Courtenay contracted habits of dissipation in the Tower. That he learned many accomplishments amidst a myriad drawbacks he proved when he burst upon the world as the "gifted and the beautiful," but the habits of drunkenness imputed to him were never acquired in the Tower, unless he was exceptionally favoured by the questionable kindness of such gaolers as Sir John Brydges. An iron discipline ruled in that fortress, for the governors were generally chosen for their hearts of steel—"needy men and reckless mostly," as Sprot remarks. Over the Thames for many a long year could have been heard the sounds of mourning and sorrow to rival those which were borne over the lagunes of Venice, and the Lion of England was as dangerous a recipient of accusations as the Lion of St. Mark, though he opened not his jaws so widely to the gaze of apprehensive citizens.

When, in Mary's time, Courtenay became free, the Papal party distrusted him, and despised his abilities for public life. In fact Mary, or "Mary's interests," to use the term in its modern meaning, liberated Courtenay seemingly in order to enable him to prove the power of

ingratitude ; he was freed and reinstated ; he rebelled and was forgiven.

One of the most candid writers on this epoch of our history (Mr. Tytler, a Presbyterian) gives a brief and tolerably impartial account of the real condition of the leading minds of the period. “ The truth seems to be,” he says, “ that the principle of toleration, whether we look to Catholics or Protestants, was utterly unknown. In this respect Gardiner and Knox, Pole and Calvin, Mary and Elizabeth, stand pretty much on the same ground.” The same writer has made a fair analysis of the characters of the two royal sisters ; and his testimony is the more valuable as he has been really the first writer who had the independence to break down the idols of historical superstition and fuse them in the crucible of truth, presenting them sternly—gold, alloy, and dross—to circulate amongst posterity. “ There are some points in English history,” observes Mr. Tytler, “ or rather in English feeling upon English history, which have become part of the national belief ; they may have been hastily or superficially assumed ; they may be proved, by as good evidence as the case admits of, to be erroneous ; but they are fondly clung to, screwed and dove-tailed into the minds of the people, and to attack them is a historical heresy. It is with these musings that I approach her who is so generally execrated as the ‘ Bloody Mary.’ The idea of exciting a feeling in her favour will appear a chimerical, perhaps a blameable one ; yet, having examined the point with some care, let me say for myself that I believe her to have been naturally rather an amiable person. Indeed, till she was thirty-nine years of age, the time of her marriage with Philip, nothing can be said against her,

unless we agree to detest her because she remained faithful to the Roman Catholic Church ; nor can there, I think, be any doubt that she has been treated by Foxe, Strype, Burnet, Carte, and other Protestant writers, with injustice. The few unpublished letters of hers which I have met with are simple, unaffected, and kind-hearted, bearing in this respect a remarkable contrast to those of Elizabeth, which are often inflated, obscure, and pedantic. The distinguishing epithets by which the two sisters are commonly known, the ‘Bloody Mary’ and the ‘Good Queen Bess,’ have evidently a reference to their times, yet we constantly employ such epithets individually. My observations apply more to Mary the Princess than to Mary the Queen. After her marriage with Philip we can trace a gradual change in her feelings and public conduct. Her devoted attachment to her husband, and the cold neglect with which he treated her, could not fail to tell upon a kind and ardent heart. Blighted hope and unrequited affection will change the best of dispositions ; and she whose youthful years had undoubtedly given good promise of a future, became disgusted with the world, suspicious, gloomy, and resentful. The subsequent cruelties of her reign were deplorable ; yet it is but fair to ascribe much of them rather to her ministers than to herself. She believed it to be a part of her religion to submit her judgment to the spiritual dictation of Pole, Gardiner, and Bonner, and they burnt men upon principle. This was a miserable mistake, bigotry in its worst sense, but we can imagine it existing in a mind rather disturbed and misled than callous<sup>3</sup>.”

It may be remarked that several writers upon this

<sup>3</sup> Tytler’s “Edward and Mary,” vol. i. pp. 49, 50.

period affirm that the persecution of Reformers under Mary “did not commence until her Highness had abdicated the office of Head of the Church as her father held it<sup>4</sup>.” Here is an evidence that, where she acted from her own judgment, there was no persecution; and it so tends to remove much of the obloquy for cruelty attached to her name. When she abdicated her religious supremacy, her Ministry assumed its responsibility, and Mary has consequently suffered in the eyes of that vast portion of posterity which cannot sever the fame of a sovereign (especially a woman) from the acts of advisers at once powerful, prejudiced, or revengeful. Foxe acknowledges that “the Queen was a woman every way excellent while she followed her own inclination.” Fuller, who may be regarded as the most truthful Protestant historian of those days, states that “she had been a worthy princess if as little had been done *under* her as *by* her.” Again, we find Foxe in his Martyrology adducing an instance of Mary’s toleration, and even of Gardiner’s mercy. Few would gainsay Foxe’s evidence in favour of either. Mary, in this instance under review, acted on her own prerogative, and her conduct does her credit. Dr. Edwin Sandys had been arrested for two offences which in Tudor days were more numerously fatal in proportion to the assumed creed of the monarch. Dr. Sandys had assailed the Queen’s title, insulted her religion, and denounced her mode of worship. Notwithstanding this, however, Mary listened to the petition of one of her ladies on behalf of Sandys, and said she would “act favourably if the Bishop of Winchester (Gardiner) did no objection make.” When the Bishop next time entered the

<sup>4</sup> Heylin, Strype, Collier, and Burnet.

council-chamber of the Queen, she said, "Winchester, what think you about Dr. Sandys? is he not sufficiently punished?" "As it pleases your Majesty," answered Gardiner, who had previously promised that if the Queen were inclined to clemency he would not stand in the way. The Queen said, "Then, truly, we would have him set at liberty." She at once signed the warrant of release, and at her instance Gardiner also set his name to the document<sup>5</sup>. In the reign of Elizabeth Sandys became a remorseless persecutor of Catholics and Dissenters.

A sweet little glade in the forest of Walthamstow local tradition yet points out as the spot where, in the former courtly amusement of "blackberrying," the lady Elizabeth "sadly tore her hand and bled much." The same tradition has it that the blackberry was "first planted here." If so, the planters had not far to carry the root, for throughout the rest of the three countries it has been one of the most obvious and sometimes annoying brambles so plentifully besetting uncultivated lands. The Saxons called it "blackberian," and seemed to like the fruit of this bramble of the genus *Rubus* as one of "pleasing taste." Such were the innocent scenes in which Elizabeth indulged during the last four years of her brother's life. How often must the memories of those sweet days of trust and love have visited Elizabeth when Queen, when the wile and faithlessness and guile of statecraft had made her heart more than hesitate to confide in virtue. Well would it have been for her, and her sister Mary likewise, if they had never reached the throne—if they had never been cast amongst those scenes of

<sup>5</sup> Foxe's *Martyrology*, book iii. p. 76.

cruelty, crime, and deception with which they were subsequently acquainted. Of course it is needless, under such circumstances, to speculate upon what would have been the verdict of an intervening posterity had the two sisters gone to the grave uncrowned; but most certainly, in the division of human sympathies then and for ever more, the memory of the “Golden-haired Eliza” would have been that of the loved and loveable—more excelling her step-sister in all the attributes which excite admiration than Mary exceeded her in conscientiousness and truth. As to the character of the two, in relation to honour and virtue, there is no comparison.

#### WYATT'S REBELLION.

QUEEN MARY's conduct during Wyatt's rebellion proves her to have possessed great courage and energy. Calm and collected amidst the din of warlike preparations, the Queen cheered the timid and impelled the tardy. She rode to the city mounted on a war charger, surrounded by her privy councillors, and attended by some ladies of her court. She did not seek London as a place of security, but entered it to encourage by her presence and cheer by her words the honest and loyal citizens, who were almost to a man faithful to her cause. Whilst Wyatt's forces held Southwark, and the rebels threatened an irruption into London of 15,000 men, the Queen rode to Guildhall, where, with the sceptre in her hand, she made a spirited speech, which she concluded in the following words:—“Wherefore, good subjects, pluck up your hearts! Like true men, stand fast with your lawful sovereign against these rebels, and fear them not, for I do not, I assure you. I leave

you, my Lord Howard and my Lord Treasurer (Winchester), to assist my Lord Mayor in the safeguard of the city from spoil and sack, which is the only aim of the rebellious crew." The Lord Mayor, in a full suit of armour, cried, "God save Queen Mary and the Prince of Spain!" and the cry was repeated by a myriad voices. In two days afterwards the army of Wyatt was beaten and dispersed, or, as has been quaintly said, "melted away like the flesh of the Psalmist." In sad truth, however, great numbers of the misguided men were ruthlessly executed by orders of the very Council, most of whom would have been rebels if revolt had promised success.

The citizens of London were determined to sustain the Queen at all hazards. On Monday, the 12th of February, a general gaol delivery took place—not by the hand of mercy, but by that of a score of executioners. Dozens of gibbets were erected all over London; and by Thursday human bodies were hanging up in St. Paul's Churchyard, London Bridge, Fleet Street, and Charing Cross<sup>6</sup>. The Queen's Council acted with dreadful severity; but it must be remembered that treason and sedition lurked in every corner of London. It was no religious war; quite the contrary; for the most influential Reformers in the city were on the Queen's side. The rebels were people impelled by many motives—some for love of booty; others, of the Anabaptist type, were opposed to all government or control; then, again, the "brave and thoughtless," who always rush to the standard of revolt. Of such conflicting material Wyatt's army was

<sup>6</sup> Stowe's "Chronicle;" "Queen Jane and Queen Mary;" Renaud's "Despatches."

composed. A religious sentiment formed the smallest element in its ranks.

If Rosso can be considered a reliable authority, Sir Thomas Wyatt assured the Duke of Norfolk that “he and his followers were in arms *not* against the Queen’s Highness, but the tyranny of the Spaniards.” It is, however, difficult to ascertain what “tyranny” the Spaniards did, or could, exercise in England at this period (1554), although the country had almost become the slave of the governing party. Nevertheless, even its domestic factions were actuated by a feeling of national pride that would not yield to any foreign influence, whether from Spain or any other country. On this point there was a cordial agreement of sentiment between spirits even antagonistic as those of Gardiner and Cranmer. As to the general merits of Sir Thomas Wyatt, he is better known in the tales of fancy than respected in the page of history. He was ill-tempered, impetuous, and when he considered his self-assumed position not acknowledged, he chafed like a “charger unbroken.” Pembroke, who knew him well, gave him all the acknowledgment in his power when he said that Sir Thomas Wyatt was faithful to his Sovereign “when she suited him.” He had been well treated by Mary; but he hoped for more distinction from Elizabeth. His loyalty was measured by his self-love; but the worshipper in a great risk broke his idol. His death-scene was the best phase of his life, for he did justice to Elizabeth and to himself. He sought to criminate Elizabeth the night before his execution, in the hope of a pardon; but on the scaffold he denied what he had stated, and most solemnly declared that the Lady Elizabeth was innocent of all participation in his treason.

He expressed a hope that he might be the last person who came there to die for so great a crime against the Queen's Highness. Turning to the populace, he asked them to pray for him, and to remember that "he died in the olden religion of England." Sir Thomas Wyatt was only three and twenty years of age, possessed of a handsome person, gracious and insinuating manners, but a stranger to candour or sincerity. Camden states that he was not a Catholic; and Foxe believes him to have been a "friend of the Reformers." Stowe, who may be almost regarded as an eye-witness of those events, contends that Wyatt was privately supported by such men as Bishop Poynter, whilst Burnet denies this statement. There can be no doubt Wyatt was a Catholic, but one of the same class as the unfortunate Thomas Seymour.

The Tower was so full of prisoners at the close of Wyatt's rebellion that Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley were placed together in a small cell, where, however, so rapid was the work of block and rope, they had to bide but for three days. At this time the merciless Renaud wrote to Charles the Fifth in these words:—"The Queen's blood is up at last. The rebels will seek mercy, but none will be extended to them. Their heads will fall off, and so will those of Courtenay and Elizabeth." But the savage prophecy was unfulfilled. The Queen under no urging of private malice contemplated this latter deed.

#### LADY JANE DUDLEY.

THE next most distinguished personage doomed to the scaffold was Lady Jane Dudley, historically known as Lady Jane Grey. This gifted and unfortunate lady,

who has been the object of such deep sympathy with posterity, was not the victim of “Popish hatred,” but of her own family, and of those fanatical Reformers who abetted the selfishness of her kindred on the score of religion, and thus assumed treason to be virtue. The latter class were not, indeed, numerous, but the treachery of such potent accomplices as Pembroke could hardly fail to prove fatal even to a rightful cause. Lady Jane could have escaped from the Tower, but she had so much reliance upon the integrity as well as power of her supporters, that she feared no peril. Of course she was soon sadly undeceived. If Queen Mary had been as free from fear as Lady Jane, and had followed her own expressed will instead of hearkening to the promptings of Lords Winchester and Pembroke, her bitterest enemies must have given her credit for some magnanimity. In monarchs there may be no greater crime than moral cowardice. It has been argued that the apprehensions of Mary in the case of Lady Jane were not so fatal to that lady as the belief instilled by the Queen’s advisers that justice demanded the sacrifice. Why did Jane’s “friends” rebel whilst she lay under sentence of death, in the power of the Queen they endeavoured to destroy?

A few hours after Wyatt’s defeat, as Queen Mary was passing through Temple Bar and witnessing the ghastly results of the revolt, Lords Pembroke, Winchester, and Arundel stopped her, and, pointing out to her the slaughter and desolation already caused by treason, solemnly assured her that such scenes would be frequent if she longer permitted her rival for the throne to live. Shocked by the bloodshed and ruin around her, and impelled by the earnest urgings of these men, the Queen

signed the death-warrant of Lady Jane, whom it is plain that Mary did not intend to execute, seeing that the sentence of death had been pronounced three months previously<sup>7</sup>, and the warrant was not put in force till the 12th February.

Poynet, who was personally acquainted with the political intrigues of the chief Reformers of Edward's and Mary's time, states that "the very men who were the sworn chiefs of the Council which proclaimed Lady Jane Grey and caused Queen Mary to be denounced as a bastard through all England and Ireland, and that were the severest forceurs of men—yea, under the threatened fear of treason, to swear and subscribe unto their doings—afterwards became counsellors, I will not say procurers of the innocent Lady Jane's death, and at the present time (Mary's reign) are in the highest offices and places in the Commonwealth." "The persons here alluded to," says Strype, "were the Lords Winchester, Pembroke, and Arundel." Turner, whose sympathies are all with the house of Tudor, makes no allowance for the position of the unhappy victim of her father, her cruel mother and mother-in-law, and her daring father-in-law. "Jane Grey had descended," he says, "from her social probity to take a royalty which was another's inheritance, and although importunity had extorted her acquiescence, yet her first reluctance gave testimony, even

<sup>7</sup> Lady Jane, her husband, and Archbishop Cranmer were arraigned together for high treason at a special Commission held in Guildhall on the 3rd of November, 1553, before Chief Justice Morgan. The prisoners all pleaded "Guilty," and, having received sentence of death, returned as they came from the Tower, on foot. Lady Jane Dudley was an object of "general sympathy with the populace." Cranmer was only noticed by a crowd of women, who made some unkind allusions to his wife. The executioner walked before him with the axe.

to herself, that she had not erred in ignorance of what was right, and no one but herself could know how much the temptation of the offered splendour had operated beyond the solicitation to seduce her to what she ought to have continued to refuse<sup>8</sup>.” Turner contends that there is no evidence to prove any perfidy against that part of the Council who composed the government of Edward the Sixth, and of whom the notables reviewed in these pages were some of the principal actors. Fraser Tytler observes, that this “extraordinary opinion of Sharon Turner is contradicted by almost every step the Council took ; by their own letters, by Cecil’s submission, by the narrative of Stowe and Holinshed, and by the express declaration of those men to Mary that *all along they had remained her true subjects.*”

Fuller remarks that Jane Grey had the “innocence of childhood, the beauty of youth, the solidity of the middle, the gravity of old age, and all at eighteen ; the birth of a princess, the learning of a clerk, the life of a saint, yet the death of a malefactor for her parent’s offences.” And Bailey observes that “she accepted the crown rather as a burthen than as a favour, and resigned it with as great indifference as she would have laid down a garland when its beauties were faded, and its scent had gone.” In Miss Strickland’s recent work, the “Princesses of Tudor,” she says, “Jane Dudley is without exception the most noble character of the royal Tudor lineage.” The above compliments to Lady Jane, when taken with the remaining text of the writings in which they appear, seem not to be the independent eulogy of conscientious admiration, for they are accompanied with the expressions of sentiments the most

<sup>8</sup> Turner’s “History of Edward and Mary.”

uncharitable towards others. The Goddess of Spring, however, rarely justifies the hopes of her admirers ; and thus if the philosophic girl and saint of eighteen were entrusted with regal power during the interval, she might at five and twenty prove a very different personage. Such a speculation is not without arguments derived from other instances of preeocious excellenee ; but the mention of such a contingency is only justified by the seetarian eulogy of Foxe and his imitators.

Most writers represent Lady Jane Grey as having always been a Protestant or Reformer, but this is not true as regards her early youth. Her father was a Catholic, if any thing, and her mother professed the same faith. Their daughter received her first communion as a Catholie, and she remained so until a visit to Catherine Parr enabled that zealous advocate of the Reformation to use the influence of her station and experience to induce young Jane to adopt the new doctrines. We find that Henry VIII. by no means approved of his wife's proselytizing tendencies, and a serious quarrel occurred between them concerning the change in Lady Jane Grey's opinions. As to Jane's father, the Marquis of Dorset, he only cared for his child being of that religion or that party which would suit best his own interests, and was ready to sell his daughter, or any thing else, for his own selfish purposes. In the early part of Elizabeth's reign De Feria, the Spanish ambassador, writes to King Philip, describing Catherine Grey, sister of the deceased Jane, as "the hope of the Catholic and legitimate party," and continues :—

"I had forgotten to tell your Majesty that Lady Catherine Grey is a good friend of mine, and talks to me in confidence. The Queen, she says, does not like to think of her as her possible successor. The

late Queen (Mary) took her into the privy chamber, and was kind to her. . . . I keep on good terms with Lady Catherine Grey; she promises me, for her part, not to change her religion, nor to marry, without my consent<sup>9</sup>."

Some years later, when Catherine Grey saw no chance of the crown, she married Lord Hertford, Somerset's son, and then became a Protestant, which so alarmed Elizabeth that she put her and her husband in the Tower under the pretence of having married without her consent. In this prison Catherine Grey died, but in her last illness she returned to the faith of her ancestors. The Greys were, like so many leading families of the time, professing Catholics—when it was not more profitable to be Protestants.

Roger Ascham, John Aylmer, and other Reformers, corresponded with Jane Grey when she was only fifteen years of age. The letters of those men were undeserving of the reputation generally accorded them, and contained what Sir Harris Nicholas styles "most injudicious flattery." Neither Ascham nor Aylmer could be chosen by a conscientious father or guardian to instruct youth, still less a female. They were both immoral, and well known to be hypocrites as to religion<sup>1</sup>. It was enough to turn the head of any girl of fifteen to be "dished" with Plato four hours a day, and then to study theology for three hours more.

Roger Ascham, in his "Schoolmaster," gives the circumstances of an interview with Lady Jane at the seat

<sup>9</sup> De Feria's "Correspondence," translated by Mr. Froude from the Simancas MSS. De Quadra, Bishop of Aquila, was the successor of Feria. He was an eminent diplomatist, and won the confidence of Elizabeth, if such were possible. His description of Elizabeth, and her extraordinary conversations with him, throw a flood of light on her real character, and are highly interesting.

<sup>1</sup> "Hatton Letter-bag;" "Archbishops of Canterbury," vol. vi.

of her father, the Marquis of Dorset, at Broadgate, Leicestershire. Sad and lonely—but not the more sad for being alone—he found the young lady reading Plato in the original tongue. Having asked her how it was possible at her early age that she could have attained such perfection both in philosophy and Greek, Lady Jane replied, “Good Maister Roger, I will tell you, and tell you a truth which perchance you will marvel to hear. One of the greatest benefits that ever God gave me is, that He sent me so sharp and severe parents and so gentle a schoolmaster. For when I am in presence either of father or mother, whether I speak, keep silence, sit, stand, or go ; eat, drink, be merry or sad ; be sewing, playing, dancing, or doing any thing else, I must do it, as it were, in such weight, measure, and number, even so perfectly as God made the world, or else I am so sharply taunted, so cruelly threatened—yea, presently, sometimes *with pinches, nips, and bobs*, and other ways which I will not name for the honour I bear them—so without measure misordered that I think myself in hell, till time come that I must go to Maister Elmer, who teacheth me so gently, so pleasantly, with such fair allurements to learning, that I think all the time nothing that I am with him. And when I am called from him I fall on weeping, because whatsoever else I do but learning is full of grief, trouble, fear, and whole misliking unto me. And thus my book hath been so much my pleasure, and bringeth daily to me more pleasure and more, that in respect of it all other pleasures, in very deed, be but trifles and troubles unto me.”

The researches of Sir Harris Nicholas have led that acute and learned observer to assure us that there is no ground for most of the marvellous stories which have

been narrated of Lady Jane. He also questions her learning, and doubts her extensive knowledge of Greek. A sad lot was that of this short-lived, hapless lady. But it is questionable if the fate compassed for her by the ambitious plot of her unprincipled father-in-law was harder than that which awaited her had she lived into the reign of Elizabeth. Lady Jane's sisters, Catherine and Mary, guiltless of any political offence, and only sinning by a lawful and virtuous love, suffered a life-long agony at the hands of Elizabeth. The life of Lady Jane would doubtless have been a "living death," for, however involuntarily, her birth was a political crime which Elizabeth's nature could not pardon.

From every source we learn that Jane Dudley was extremely amiable. When she retired from her books or her flower-garden she delighted in the society of children; was devoted in friendship to a few female friends; her benevolence and charity were on a large scale and without a shade of ostentation. She inherited some of the peculiarities of Elizabeth Woodville, her great-grandmother, the "Queen of Many Sorrows."

When Feckenham procured a further respite of three days for Lady Jane, she thanked him for his kindness and humanity, but she was prepared to receive patiently her death "in any manner it should please the Queen to appoint." The "discourse on religion" which took place between Lady Jane and the abbot has been misrepresented in almost every point of view. One writer states that "Feckenham declared he was so ignorant of the questions at issue that she was put to instruct him."<sup>2</sup> In

<sup>2</sup> The only person who really furnished a correct account of the discussion was Feckenham himself; and all other reports of it are pure invention. So much for Foxo and his "correspondents."

the accounts published by Foxe and Speed the abbot is completely confounded by the girl theologian of eighteen ; in fact, he appears to be ignorant of history, of Scripture, and of theology ; a shallow man, destitute of eloquence or powers of reasoning. If the report of Maister Foxe was correct, then Jane Dudley did not study Protestant principles as propounded by Cranmer. The girl is made far too clever, and the picture is over-drawn. Those who may take the trouble of searching into the history of this “amiable abbot,” as Mr. Froude describes him—and as some Puritan writers acknowledge—will find that he was a ripe scholar and an able theologian.

On the morning of her execution Lady Jane Dudley was occupied for several hours at her devotions, and excited the sympathy of all who approached her. The Governor of the Tower “much marvelled that one so young could display so philosophic an indifference to the things of earth ;” and Mr. Ludlow, who was present, writes that “she did not fear to die, but rather rejoiced as the time approached.”

In her short passage from the prison to the scaffold, the fortitude of Lady Jane was terribly tried by meeting the headless body of her husband borne back to the Tower. Grafton, who was a contemporary, and perhaps present, gives this account of the scene :—“The Lord Guildforde Dudlie’s dead carkas lyin in a carre in strawe was againe brought into the Tower at the same instant that my Ladi Jane his wife went to her death within the Tower, which miserable sight was to her a double sorrow and grieve.” The “girl-widow” paused and gazed at the woful spectacle, raised her eyes to Heaven, and in silence walked on. The agony of death seemed past. Yet, perhaps, young Lord Guildford Dudley was one of

the most unimportant victims *per se* that ever mounted a scaffold for treason. His “mother’s pet,” a spoiled, obstinate boy, who, in his brief kingship, wept for not being worshipped—devoid of talent, as he was of every hopeful manly virtue, he yearned for a throne without the genius or principle to fill an honest subordinate position. His bad, imperious mother gave him evil advice, and was privy to his despicable ill-treatment of his noble young wife, whom he “struck and swore at on several occasions,” Lady Jane, whose short life seemed but a rehearsal for the final tragedy, receiving the ill-treatment without a murmur, merely observing, “It is the duty of a wife to obey her husband and love him too<sup>3</sup>.” The bitterest of comments for a man with an atom of sense or generosity. In religion, too, Guildford Dudley was his father’s son. If he had the sense or principle to be any thing, he was *not* a Reformer, but one of a family who put on their religion like a doublet, and worshipped Heaven—if they ever did worship—at the altar of political expediency. Lord Guildford was not the man to die a martyr for any creed, nor did his death partake even so much of martyrdom as that it was compassed, as has been so often alleged, by Gardiner. It was not the Bishop of Winchester, in fact, but the Earl of Pembroke who, from some miserable hatred to the unfortunate youth, wrought his death. The young man, as to religious faith, was the opposite of his wife. Raised against her will to a throne by those who hated and maltreated whilst they used her, she conscientiously repelled the ambition which devoured her giddy help-

<sup>3</sup> The object of Lady Jane’s first love was young Lord Hertford, to whom she was actually engaged, and consequently could not legally marry Lord Dudley. Here again she became the victim of her cruel parents.

mate. The fatal height to which he aspired, and from which he was so soon prostrated, was the sole religion of Lord Guildford Dudley; and it is the mere reverse of fact and common sense to set him down as a Protestant martyr. It was averred in the same century that the Emperor of China was a Jesuit, yet experience has pretty well proved that assertion is seldom good proof. Lord Guildford Dudley did nothing in his short life to make any religion or party covet his inclusion in their ranks.

Jane Dudley was not executed on the Tower Hill, on the same spot as her husband. She suffered on a scaffold specially erected on the "green," within the Tower. There were not more than three hundred persons present. The Abbot Feckenham accompanied her to the scaffold, which he ascended with a crucifix in his hand; but Lady Jane remained steadfast in her newly adopted opinions<sup>4</sup>. After six months' sorrowful confinement the hapless lady looked pale and worn. "When she came to the front of the scaffold," writes a spectator, "the people cried and murmured at beholding one so young and beautiful about to die such a death."

Lady Jane then addressed the people in her usual modest manner, declaring that she had justly deserved the punishment she was about to receive, for allowing herself to be the instrument, although unwilling, of the ambition of others. She prayed that God might bless the Queen and grant her a long life and a prosperous reign, and in emphatic words called on the people to be loyal to their Sovereign, and to remember her fate as a

<sup>4</sup> In parting with Feckenham, Lady Jane expressed her gratitude for his humanity and the kindness she received from him.—See Goodwin's "Queen Mary."

warning. She forgave her enemies, and besought the prayers of the people that she might be able to endure her sufferings with fortitude. Her maids having advanced, she then prepared for the last scene. She "was very brave of heart," says Maister Radcliffe, "considering the condition she was in."<sup>5</sup>

Lady Jane tied the handkerchief before her own eyes, and *then felt for the block*, observing, "What shall I do? Where is it?" One of the gentlemen on the platform guided her to the spot, when she knelt down and laid her head on that fatal pillow which was soon to crimson with her royal blood. Stretching forth her body, she then exclaimed, in a firm voice, "Lord, into Thy hands I commend my spirit."<sup>6</sup> The usual five minutes for "royal mercy" appeared like an age to those present; it was one of horrible suspense, but no "white wand" bearing mercy appeared. Every hope had fled! A tall and powerful headsman next approached, and, raising his glittering steel, the earthly career of poor Jane Dudley closed for ever.

What an awful spectacle! The brief splendour of Lady Jane's royalty was but as the passing sunbeam lighting up a grave. She was unhappy throughout life, unblessed in her parents, a fine and comprehensive mind driven and narrowed into a belief which was but simulated in those on whom she naturally placed reliance, infelicitous in her compelled espousals, yet with conscientious dutifulness loving at the death more than in the life. If Ambition could ever have had a victim

<sup>5</sup> Fuller alleges that it was strongly bruited (reported) at the time that Lady Jane was pregnant. Chaloner seems to believe this report; and Pomeroy, a contemporary, says there can be no doubt but "she was with child." Sir Harris Nicholas, and other antiquarians of history, give no credit to this tale.

<sup>6</sup> "The Ende of the Ladi Jane Dudlie on the Scaffolde." Printed 1558.

that deserved the name of martyr, it was Jane Dudley. Her fate is one of the saddest episodes on the roll of England's history<sup>7</sup>.

## THE DUKE OF SUFFOLK.

HENRY GREY, Marquis of Dorset and Duke of Suffolk, soon followed his daughter to the scaffold. His second attempt at rebellion, whilst Lady Jane lay under sentence of death in the Tower, was not generally approved by the moderate section of the Reformers. He fell unpitied. His treachery and ingratitude to the Queen; his disregard of his unfortunate daughter's perilous position at the time; and his baseness in attempting to purchase his own pardon by accusing his friends of treason, sharpened public indignation against him<sup>8</sup>. The character of Suffolk has been presented to posterity by party feeling; he was not, however, the man for whom any party should contend. Sir H. Nicholas represents him as “a quiet, unambitious man;” whilst his restless love of intrigue proves the contrary. Dugdale states that he was “neither disliked nor much regarded.” Some of his contemporaries consider him “weak-minded, hesitating between ambition and duty; rash, obstinate, and devoid of judgment.” He was neither a statesman nor a general; and his chief pleasure

<sup>7</sup> There is a beautiful little illuminated Prayer Book in Latin, enclosed in a morocco case, in the British Museum, which book Lady Jane had with her on the scaffold. There is on a fly-leaf some writing of Lady Jane, in a fine bold hand: “Lord, I trust in thee—let me never be confounded;” and the writing concludes, “Yours, as the Lord knoweth,—Jane Dudley.” Close by this most interesting relic is a “Book of Prayers,” in the handwriting of the Princess Elizabeth, executed in 1545, when the writer was scarcely twelve years old.

<sup>8</sup> Lingard, vol. v. p. 433.

lay “in a country life, amongst the sporting and convivial squires.” His was one of the oldest families in the English peerage, and he dispensed hospitality on a large scale. He was, however, a man of no principle, and had little regard for any religious sentiment. When Marquis of Dorset, he was as unscrupulous in obtaining Church plunder as any of his contemporaries. In 1550 Archbishop Cranmer remonstrated with him for “still despoiling and maiming Church property.” “It is an old saying,” writes Cranmer, “that nobody can grow rich by the stealing and taking of private people’s possessions, much less by robbing the public. What sense then hath he of God, that doubts not that his riches shall increase to good purpose, that commits sacrilege, and robs the Church of what belongs to it<sup>9</sup>? ” It did not come with a good grace from the Archbishop to argue in this style. Suffolk might have traced all the misfortunes of his house to the family connexion with the Dudleys. Pardoned by his Sovereign, he again became a traitor; was betrayed by his own domestic; immured in the Tower, tried for treason according to the laws of those times; and adjudged for death. He ascended the scaffold with contrition for his treason, but died indifferent to all religion. Suffolk’s brother, Lord Thomas Grey, was also executed for high treason. He was a man of talent, high spirit, and some ambition. It is supposed he induced his elder brother to embark a second time in treason. He professed to be a staunch friend of the Reformation, but the night before his execution he expressed a wish to have a confessor. In early youth he was very pious, and resided for a time in the Palace of the Bishop of London.

<sup>9</sup> Strype’s “Cranmer,” vol. i. p. 299.

## THE QUEEN'S MARRIAGE.

In the choice of a husband Queen Mary disregarded the advice of her lay and clerical councillors. Father Peto, who outlived the storms of Henry's reign, and was then in an eminent position in Rome, wrote to the Queen advising her against a marriage with a young husband at her time of life. His letter to the Queen was not flattering or even courteous ; but it was what might be expected from the man who had the hardihood and daring to tell her father to his face that he was an adulterer, and that the time would come when the dogs would lick his blood like those in the case of Ahab. "Do not marry," writes Peto to the Queen, "or you will be the slave of a young husband ; besides, at your age, the chance of bringing heirs to the Crown is doubtful, and, moreover, would be dangerous to your life." However the Queen might have felt insulted at this mode of conveying an advice, which was really honest, she expressed no displeasure against the old confessor and friend of her mother. She had made up her mind to marry Philip, and neither Father Peto nor her Council could change her resolve. Dr. Gardiner repeatedly opposed the marriage, and placed many restrictions upon the privileges to be accorded to Philip as the Queen's husband. Mary wished to have Philip crowned at Westminster Abbey ; Gardiner and the Council decided otherwise<sup>1</sup>.

On Friday, the 20th of July, 1554, Philip, accompanied by the combined fleets of England and Spain, arrived at Southampton from Corunna. The Govern-

<sup>1</sup> Martin's " Chronicle."

ment, the nobles, and the people of all parties, gave him “a respectful and cordial reception.” There are letters still extant descriptive of his person. One writer states that his “complexion was cane-coloured ; his hair sandy and scanty ; his eyes small, blue, and weak, with a gloomy expression of face, which is not pleasing in a person of very light complexion. A mighty volume of brain, although it sloped too much towards the top of the head, denoting that he was a man of much ability.” A gentleman who stood near Philip on his landing thus describes his appearance :— “Of visage he is well favoured, with a broad forehead and grey eyes, straight-nosed and manly countenance ; from his forehead to the point of his chin his face groweth small ; his pace is princely, and gait so straight and upright as he loseth no inch of his height ; with a yellow head and a yellow beard ; and thus, to conclude, he is so well-proportioned of body, arm, leg, and every other limb to the same as nature cannot work a more perfect pattern. He is twenty-eight years of age.”<sup>2</sup> His manners were cold and repulsive ; yet he evinced, as well as his haughty nature would permit, a desire to become popular.

Philip was full of hesitation as to whether he should come to England at all. From the reports forwarded to him his prospects were not cheering. The Queen sent him a message to bring over his own cook, lest he should be poisoned in the food prepared for him (Renaud to Charles V.). He was profuse in costly presents to the English nobles and gentlemen ; and presented an offering of jewels to his bride valued at fifty thousand golden ducats. His hospitality was on a magnificent

<sup>2</sup> John Elder’s “Letter ;” “Queen Mary and Queen Jane.”

scale ; and the expenditure of money amongst the people in various ways was almost incredible. It is said that his treasurer had charge of twelve chests of gold coin. After several interviews with his affianced bride at Winchester, the marriage of Don Philip and Queen Mary took place in the cathedral of that old city five days after his arrival in England. Philip was attended to the high altar by sixty Spanish grandees. He was dressed in a robe of rich brocade bordered with large pearls and diamonds ; his trunk-hose were of white satin worked with silver. He wore a collar of beaten gold full of diamonds sparkling like stars ; the jewel of the Golden Fleece was in its accustomed position ; and at his knee was the Garter of England studded with precious gems. Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, in magnificent vestments, accompanied by five other prelates, stood before the altar, awaiting the arrival of the Queen. The Cathedral was filled with people who evinced a loyal wish to see their Queen married, especially to so rich a man as “ Maister Prince Philip.” A few minutes before eleven of the clock the shouts of the populace announced the arrival of the Queen, who walked on foot under a canopy from the palace. She was accompanied by a large number of peers, knights, and squires. The rank and beauty of the nobility were also well represented on the occasion.

The Queen was dressed in the French fashion, in a robe richly brocaded on a gold ground, with a long train splendidly bordered with pearls and diamonds of great size. The large *re-bras* sleeves were turned up with clusters of gold set with pearls and diamonds. Her *chaperon* or *coif* was bordered with two rows of large diamonds. The close gown, or kirtle, worn

beneath the robe, was of white satin wrought with silver. On her breast the Queen wore that remarkable diamond of inestimable value sent to her as a gift by King Philip whilst he was still in Spain, by the Marquis de Las Naves. So far, the dress was in good taste, but the accession of scarlet shoes and *brodequins*, and a black velvet scarf, added to this costume by the royal bride, could scarcely be considered improvements. The chair on which Queen Mary sat is still shown at Winchester Cathedral, and report says it was a present from Rome<sup>3</sup>. The marriage was preceded by an oration from Figueroa, Regent of Naples, who stated that "Charles V., his Imperial master, having contracted a marriage between the Queen of England and his son Philip, Prince of Spain, in order to make the parties equal, he resigned his kingdom of Naples, so that Queen Mary married a King, and not a Prince." The ceremony then proceeded, when the question was asked, "Who gives away this bride?" the Marquis of Winchester, the Earls of Derby, Bedford, and Pembroke came forward, and "in the name of the people of England gave away the bride." Here the people congregated in the cathedral gave a loud shout, exclaiming, "God send them both happiness!"

What a strange scene to behold the Catholic Queen "given away in marriage" by the men here named, and who played such a remarkable part in the past and following reign! The Queen was wedded with "a plain ring, like any other maiden." King Philip, according to the Catholic custom, laid on the Bishop's book three handfuls of gold coins and some large silver pieces.

<sup>3</sup> "Queens of England," vol. v. p. 395.

When the Lady Margaret Douglas saw the coins, she opened the Queen's purse, and her Highness was observed to smile on her as she put the bridal gold within it. Lady Margaret Douglas was the Queen's cousin, and her chief bridesmaid ; the Earl of Pembroke was in attendance on Philip throughout the ceremonies. The High Mass, sermon, &c., " did not conclude until three of the clock."

The hall of the episcopal palace in which the bridal banquet took place was hung with arras striped with gold and silver ; it had a state daïs raised at the upper end ascended by four steps. A table was here laid out for the King and Queen, to which the Bishop of Winchester was invited ; as also Lord Pembroke, whose pious demeanour in the cathedral that day made a marked impression on King Philip. Below the daïs were spread several tables on which the ladies of the Court, the Spanish grandees, and the English nobility were feasted. Here the Marquis of Winchester, with his " polished and gracious manners," represented the Queen, and " made the guests feel at home." " Delightful music " was performed in a gallery erected for the purpose ; and " between the courses " four heralds entered in their gorgeous mantles and pronounced orations in the name of the people of England ; also an eloquent address in favour of marriage. King Philip made a pleasing speech to the Privy Council and the English nobility ; but " his bride discoursed more eloquently." The banquet ended at six of the clock, when dancing commenced in the most lively fashion. " Young and old," writes a spectator, " were on the floor, and right gailie they stepped it up and down the hall." At ten of the clock the wedding festivities

concluded, all present drinking to the bride and bridegroom<sup>4</sup>.

For a few days the epithets of "heretic," "papist," and "hot-Gospeller" were laid aside, and all parties seemed to act in delightful harmony; but the fiendish spirit of retaliation, insubordination, and sectarian hate only slumbered for awhile to burst forth with renewed vigour, casting shame and odium upon the nation at large<sup>5</sup>.

#### CARDINAL POLE.

DR. STEPHENSON, in his calendar of the State Papers of 1558-59, relates that the Privy Council of Mary were urging forward the persecution of Reformers, and chided the bishops for their "slowness in the work;" and that even Bonner was subjected to their pressure, ordering him in full conclave to "execute certain condemned heretics, and to proceed against others<sup>6</sup>." Yet several members of this Privy Council were afterwards

<sup>4</sup> Baoardo's "Qneen Mary;" Tytler, vol. ii.; Miss Strickland's "Queens of England," vol. v.

<sup>5</sup> Philip resided not more than eleven months in England, during which period he gave sufficient proof that he did not marry the "poor half-dying" Queen for love. While in England the people or the Government had no reason to find fault with him. He spent a princely sum here in a few months; and, as the reader is already aware, he caused hundreds to be released from prison. He was also on intimate terms with Elizabeth. His character has been handed down in an odious light by Puritan writers. A portion of his subjects changed their religion, and then became rebels. He attempted to put them down with a strong hand, but they triumphed, and disgraced their victories by horrible atrocities. It may, however, be said of him with truth, that he was a bad son, a bad hnsband, and a despotic ruler. He ended his days, however, in a manner becoming a good Christian; his end presenting a remarkable contrast to the wretched exit of his unscrupulous rival, Elizabeth Tudor.

<sup>6</sup> R. O. Domest. Mary, ix. 30.

connected with the Government of Elizabeth; and often, against the Queen's wishes, impelled persecution in favour of the Reformation—when that event seemed established!

The evidence upon this epoch is most conflicting. More than one writer informs us that Cardinal Pole was the author of persecution against Reformers, whilst Pole's words of denunciation against persecution are on record; and these words were uttered when he had the power to persecute, *and did not*. Archbishop Parker described him as the “hangman and the scourge of the Church of England.” Courtesy was no quality of either Parker or Poynet; in fact, the spirit of reform seemed to have extirpated the ancient chivalry of our tongue. But a little inconsistency in a contemporary narrative strikes one in relation to Pole, whom Mr. Froude describes in one passage as the author of “all the persecutions,” whilst in another he proclaims the Cardinal's character as “irreproachable: in all the *virtues of the Catholic Church he walked without spot or stain.*” Is there any reservation here? “Virtue” has been no relative term since the expulsion from Paradise. It is the same since the Chaldeans, in their contemplation of those Heaven's ambassadors, the stars, pierced the eunpyrean, and deified Virtue at the footstool of the Eternal. Virtue is of no Church: it is the pure heritage of all good men, and in that possession persecution of any kind can have no share. But to resume. Even Foxe quotes a letter of Bonner to Cardinal Pole, dated December 26, 1556, from which it appears that the Cardinal disapproved of Bonner's proceedings against the Reformers. This disapprobation must have been strongly expressed, to judge by the reply of

Bonner. In a confidential letter to the Cardinal of Augsburg, Pole wrote, “*In general, lenity is to be preferred to severity; and men ought to show the tenderness of parents even when they are compelled to punish<sup>7</sup>.*” Burnet states that Pole “declined all interference with the executions daily taking place, and he considered *the reformation of mankind was his duty*. He blamed Gardiner for not relying more on spiritual than temporal agencies. He was known to rescue from Bonner’s prisons *crowds* who had been condemned to the flames<sup>8</sup>. ” Gardiner’s long connexion with political affairs unfortunately far more inclined him to use the machinery of arbitrary power than the benign action of the spiritual influence recommended by Cardinal Pole. However individuals may have acted, the sentiments of Reginald Pole were those of the vast majority of the bishops and abbots who composed the Council of Trent. Foxe and Sir Thomas Smith affirm that Philip of Spain was the author and inciter of “all the cruelties perpetrated against the Reformers.” Sir Thomas Smith derives his claims to credence on this subject from being closely in connexion with the secret movements of the Reformers; but Smith is by no means a trustworthy witness. Alphonso de Castro, chief chaplain to Philip, denounced the persecution of which his royal master was accused of being the promoter. De Castro’s sermons against burnings made a great impression upon all minds in London, and for six weeks the work of the stake was stayed. The preacher was specially severe upon Bonner for his part in those cruel persecutions. He admitted no

<sup>7</sup> Pole, Epist. iv. 156.

<sup>8</sup> Burnet’s “History of the Reformation,” vol. ii.; Strype’s “Memorials;” Sir J. Mackintosh, Turner, Lingard.

excuse for any, much less a bishop, participating in such sanguinary transactions. Gardiner, who was the *alter ego* of governmental rule in England in Mary's reign—a man who, with all his faults, had the pervading sense of a grand old insular independence, and hated Philip to the very latchet of his shoe because his was a strong power on the Continent, and because Gardiner himself was a Briton—was not likely to be the henchman or expert of the Spanish monarch. Dr. Stephenson, from his researches, points at Philip as the persecutor. This may be accepted as good authority, but *in partibus*. The evidence of Dr. Stephenson is from the State Papers in the offices in London; but there are other State Papers, called those of Simaneas, to which Mr. Froude has given the benefit of an admirable translation and a manly exposition. In a conversation with De Quadra, Elizabeth assured the ambassador that “during his master's stay in England *he had been a general benefactor, and had never injured a creature*.”

## THE STAKE AND THE RACK.

THE burnings for heresy form the chief blot on Mary's reign; and it is small justification of the Sovereign or the Council that “it was the statute law of the land,” that Henry had sent people to the stake for religious opinion, and that Cranmer and Coverdale, representing Edward the Sixth and the Reformers, did the same. Nor were such examples any excuse for Elizabeth's burning of the Anabaptists, and the multitudinous executions, torturings, and imprisonments throughout her reign. One remark as to Queen Mary. The number of burn-

<sup>9</sup> Froude's “History of England,” vol. vii.

ings in her reign have been incredibly exaggerated. In this matter the statements of Foxe are without a parallel in the realms of falsehood. Even in the corrupt House of Commons of Mary's reign thirty-seven members seceded in consequence of the persecutions carried on by the Government and abetted by the House. This small contingent of humanity's phalanx consisted of thirty-four Catholics and three professing Protestants; the leader of them, Serjeant Plowden, a distinguished Catholic jurist, to whom Elizabeth subsequently offered the Chancellorship if he abjured Popery, to which he is stated to have returned for answer, "No, Madame, not for the wealth of the realm." Camden, in speaking of Plowden, wrote, "How excellent a medley is made when *honesty* and *ability* meet in a man of Plowden's profession!" A strong proof this remark of the general unworthiness of the members of the legal calling<sup>1</sup>.

There is one remarkable fact connected with Mary's rule—namely, that the barbarous rack was wholly set aside by the Queen's orders. It has been frequently asserted that the Catholic Church "inculcated and encouraged the persecution for religious opinion;" that the "Pontiffs themselves were foremost in acts of cruelty and blood." These accusations are mere assertions, and have not been made by any writers of repute and honesty. In all ages the Papacy was to be heard in denunciation of persecution and oppression; but the military despots of those times were little controlled by the Pope where vengeance or interest interposed. There are still extant the solemn

<sup>1</sup> Serjeant Plowden was an ancestor of Francis Plowden, whose History of Ireland was so true, fearless, and honest, that the author was compelled to go into exile some ninety years ago—a period when truth even in historical matters was a perilous affair to deal with.

warnings of the early fathers and pontiffs of the Church against the practice of persecuting men for their religious belief. St. Anstин says, “Let us bewail those who go astray ; let us endeavour to bring them back to their duty : but never give them room for complaint. For we were not sent to strike, but to instruct and to reprove with mildness, though with firmness.” Leo the Tenth once observed that the “followers of Christ cannot propagate His divine law by fire or sword ; they must teach as He taught, and be gentle in bringing back stray or wandering sheep.” A pontiff of a recent date, and who suffered much from the arbitrary will of a military potentate, has left this sentiment on record:—“The divine law is not of the same nature as that of man, but a law of persuasion and gentleness. Persecution, exile, and imprisonment are suitable only to false prophets and the apostles of false doctrines.”

The words of Charles I. to his Puritan enemies are, if possible, more applicable to the great majority of the alleged martyrs of Mary’s time, when he said “that the mask of religion on the face of rebellion will not serve to hide some men’s deformities.” Dean Hook, so hostile to Queen Mary and Cardinal Pole, makes the following admission respecting the brief reign of Mary:—“For one person executed in this reign for religion *there were a hundred butchered for treason*<sup>2</sup>.” Miss Strickland, in the fifth volume of her interesting and valuable

<sup>2</sup> A full record of the persecutions by Elizabeth and her ministers on account of religion would fill volumes. In every form of blood and plunder, the persecution was carried out to the end of a long and evil life. It would be a dreary chronicle to write ; and it may be sufficient to state briefly that the great mass of the English people have been very imperfectly informed on these matters, or rather have been grossly misled by their hitherto accepted historians.

work, states that the Marian persecutions have been “greatly exaggerated;” and no one can gainsay that lady’s devotion to Protestantism. Bonner should have left the evil law to other hands: he should have saved the creed of his fathers from the stigma of having its white robes dragged through the blood and mire of turbulent politics. Bonner has been presented to the Protestant reader as a “cruel monster.” On the other hand, he has been defended by some Catholic writers who seem to know little of his antecedents or merits. In the divorce controversy of Katherine of Arragon he was one of the King’s most earnest advocates. In his missions to Rome he was “insolent, indecent, and unscrupulous in his mode of acting.” Silja de Fodi, Clement’s physician, who was present at Bonner’s violent entry of the Pontiff’s chamber at midnight, says, “As usual, Dr. Bonner was rude and insulting to the Holy Father, who spoke gently but firmly to him, telling him to leave immediately, to remember that he was a priest and standing in the presence of Christ’s Vicar.” Bonner still spoke of the power of his royal master, telling the Holy Father to “beware of the vengeance of England.” The Pontiff, stretching forth his arm, said, “You will end your days in one of your master’s dungeons. Go, go; may God forgive you!” There are still extant letters of Henry VIII. admonishing Bonner for the violent language he used to the Pope. “You should remember,” says Henry, “that the Pontiff is the great spiritual head of the Christian world, and therefore commands the reverence of us all. I am sorry that your bad temper and want of manners got the better of your natural good sense.” “Few men,” writes Dodd, “received such rapid

promotion as Bonner. Within a fortnight he was Bishop of Hereford and then of London. In Henry's reign he went with the times (the Court) : he advocated the divorce of Katherine of Arragon, supported the King's supremacy, and the dissolution of the monastic houses<sup>3</sup>." In Elizabeth's reign he was consigned to the Fleet, where he died, after ten years' confinement; thus fulfilling the prophecy of the Pope, and having had time to repent the injuries he had inflicted on the cause of religion and the social welfare of England<sup>4</sup>.

## DR. GARDINER.

GARDINER was one of the most distinguished prelates of his time. He was a statesman much in advance of the disjointed and dishonest period in which he lived. His indisputable respect for the constitutional liberties of England, as they were then understood, gained for him the hearty hatred of foreign despots. He was as inaccessible to the allurements of Spain as he was to the menaces of France. He was also proof against the subtleties of oligarchical tyranny embodied in the Republic of Venice. "Gardiner and the majority of the papal bishops," writes Sir James Mackintosh, "were opposed to the persecution of Reformers." Dr. Maitland, whose great research and stern impartiality command attention, believes "that Gardiner has been misrepresented and belied." Later still, Dean Hook remarks that the attempt is made to fasten the blame of the persecutions upon Gardiner and Bonner. "When," he

<sup>3</sup> Dodd's "Church History," vol. i.

<sup>4</sup> In Maitland's "Essays on the Reformation" (p. 406) the reader will find an interesting chapter, entitled "Bonner's Cruelties," which throws a new light on his career in Mary's reign.

says, “we examine the facts of history instead of relying on the statements of partisans, we must come to the conclusion that this is incorrect with regard to Gardiner ; and, coarse and unfeeling as Bonner was, even with respect to him, it is only partially true. . . . When Gardiner was at the zenith of his power, in 1553-54, and in the last year of his life, *fewer were burnt than at any other period of Mary's reign<sup>5</sup>.*” Peter Martyr and John Sturmius, both uncompromising Reformers, bear testimony to the “humane and kindly” treatment they received from the Bishop of Winchester ; Hadrian Junius, the physician of King Edward VI., also speaks favourably of the Bishop, and says he was the “very opposite of a bad man.” Roger Ascham has left on record an interesting relation of Gardiner's “kindly consideration for men of learning, in which he was never swayed by religious or party considerations.” Before his death Gardiner became “a wiser and a sadder man.” In one of his last sermons at Paul's Cross he deplored his conduct in Henry's reign. “I was awfully in error,” he says, “in my past conduct. Let me impress on you, good people, that *Catholicity and the Papacy can never be severed by any earthly power ; they will remain united together to the end of time.*” In a letter of Dr. Whyte (Gardiner's successor) to the celebrated Father Chauncey of Bruges, he states that his friend's most earnest desire was that he might live long enough to confront Elizabeth and her Council in a defence of Catholicity, and, like Bishop Fisher, to die on the scaffold for the creed of his fathers.

<sup>5</sup> “Archbishops of Canterbury,” vol. vii. p. 306.

## CRANMER'S TRIAL.

CRANMER'S first trial took place before Chief Justice Morgan, at Guildhall, where he was found guilty and sentenced to death, but was subsequently pardoned by the Queen and handed over to the ecclesiastical powers to deal with him for heresy. On Saturday, the 7th September, 1555, he was arraigned before a special commission held in St. Mary's Church, Oxford. The Bishop of Gloucester presided, assisted by four other prelates. Archbishop Cranmer appeared weak and feeble ; his clothes were nearly threadbare, and he was compelled to lean upon a staff. Those who remembered the strong and active prelate of a few years before could scarcely recognize him now. His jaws were drawn in ; his piercing eyes became glassy and sunk ; the pleasant countenance changed to the wan visage of despair, and his hair "white as silver."

The Proctor read a long series of charges of heresy against the Archbishop. Cranmer replied that he denied the authority of the Pope altogether. "I have sworn," said he, "never to admit the authority of the Bishop of Rome in England, and I must keep my oath." In another passage he said, "You attribute the *keys* to the Pope, and the *sword* to the King. I say the King hath the *keys* and the *sword*." The substance of his elaborate reply is to the effect that at no time did he believe in the principles of the Catholic Church—although he had repeatedly sworn to those principles with the utmost solemnity, and sent men to the stake for not maintaining them. The President of the Court informed the Archbishop that they represented his Holiness the

Pope in part, and also the King and Queen ; but Cranmer again denied the jurisdiction of the Pope, stating that he was a prisoner brought there against his will, and all he could do was to protest against the proceedings.

Dean Hook describes the Bishop of Gloucester's address to Cranmer as "kind, charitable, and considerate." The Archbishop's replies to the Commissioner and Proctor involved a series of contradictions ; but then he was unaided by counsel, and cross-examined by men who were more than a match for him at theological fence. Dr. Martyn, the Proctor, cross-questioned him at some length, when the following scene took place :—

*Dr. Martyn.*—What doctrine was taught by you when you condemned Lambert, the Sacramentary, in the King's presence at Whitehall ?

*Archbishop Cranmer.*—I maintained then the Papists' doctrine.

*Dr. Martyn.*—That is to say, the Catholic and universal doctrine of Christ's Church. And how, when King Henry died ? Did you not translate Justus Jonus's book ?

*Archbishop Cranmer.*—I did so.

*Dr. Martyn.*—Then there you defended another doctrine touching the Sacrament by the same token that you sent to Lynne, your printer ; that when, as in the first print, there was an affirmative—that is to say, Christ's body really in the Sacrament—you sent then to your printer to put in a "not," whereby it came miraculously to pass, that Christ's body was clean conveyed out of the Sacrament.

*Archbishop Cranmer.*—I remember there were two printers of my said book, but where the same "not" was put in I cannot tell.

*Dr. Martyn.*—Then from a Lutheran you became a Zuinglian, which is the vilest heresy of all in the Sacrament ; and for the same heresy you did help to burn Lambert, the Sacramentary, *which you now call the Catholic faith* and God's Word.

*Archbishop Cranmer.*—I grant that then I believed otherwise than I do now, and so I did until my Lord of London, Dr. Ridley, did confer with me, and by sundry persuasions and authorities of doctors showed me quite from my opinion.

*Dr. Martyn.*—Now, sir, as touching the last part of your oration, you denied that the Pope's holiness was supreme head of the Church of Christ?

*Archbishop Cranmer.*—I did so.

*Dr. Martyn.*—But whom hath Christ here on earth as His vicar and head of His Church?

*Archbishop Cranmer.*—Nobody.

*Dr. Martyn.*—Ah! why told you not King Henry this when you made him Supreme Head? And now nobody is. This is treason against his own person, as you then made him.

*Archbishop Cranmer.*—I meant not but every king in his own realm and dominion is supreme head; and so was he supreme head of the Church of Christ in England.

*Dr. Martyn.*—Is this always true? And was it ever so in Christ's Church?

*Archbishop Cranmer.*—It was so.

*Dr. Martyn.*—Then what say you of Nero? he was the mightiest prince of the earth after Christ was ascended. Was he head of Christ's Church?

*Archbishop Cranmer.*—Nero was Peter's head.

*Dr. Martyn.*—I ask whether Nero was head or no? If he was not, it is false that you said before that all princes be and ever were heads of the Church within their realms?

*Archbishop Cranmer.*—Why, it is true, for Nero was head of the Church, that is in worldly respects of the temporal bodies of men, of whom the Church consisteth; for so he beheaded Peter and the Apostles. And the Turk, too, is head of the Church in Turkey.

*Dr. Martyn.*—Then he that beheaded the heads of the Church and crucified the Apostles was head of Christ's Church; and he that was never member of the Church is head of the Church of your new-found understanding of God's Word?

The Proctor again interrupted Cranmer as to who was Supreme Head of the Church of England. “Marry,” said the Archbishop, “Christ is head of this member, as He is of the whole of the body, of the Universal Church.” “Why,” quoth Martyn, “you made King Henry the Eighth Supreme head of the Church?” “Yea,” said the Archbishop, “of all the people of England, as well ecclesiastical as temporal.” “And not of the Church?” asked the Proctor. “No,” said

Cranmer, “*for Christ is only* head of His Church, and of the faith and religion of the same. The King is head and governor of his people, which are the visible Church.”

It does not require much acumen to discover here a shiftiness and inconsistency—a transparency of argument, a thinness, so to say, of verbiage, a set of distinctions without differences, and a series of “hair-splittings”—that fairly denote the casuistry of Cranmer’s theology. In the bygone he had admitted Christ’s delegation of the headship of His Church to Peter, who bequeathed it to his successors at Rome: now, with him, Christ was alone the Head of the invisible Church, and the monarch the head of the visible Church—that is, the people. Then the Moslem or Pagan monarchs of Christians in all the lands of the earth must be, there, the heads of Christ’s Church, according to this argument—a statement which Cranmer did not believe; but in the endeavour to seem consistent he became unmeaning.

#### ARCHBISHOP CRANMER AT THE STAKE.

At last the final judgment arrived from Rome, which was confirmed by the Queen and her Council. After an imprisonment of three years, and undergoing several trials, it was decreed that the Archbishop should be sent to the stake. When informed that he should die the death of a heretic, he at first appeared horrified, but a ray of hope seemed to have struck him. Shortly after he made several recantations of faith. In his “fifth recantation” he anathematized especially the persons of Luther and Zwinglius, accepted the Pope as the head

of the Church, out of which there was no salvation, acknowledged the “Real Presence” in the Eucharist, the Seven Sacraments as received by the Church of Rome, and also Purgatory. He expressed his penitence for having held or taught otherwise, and he implored “the prayers of all faithful Christians, that those whom he had seduced might be brought back to the true fold.” Mr. Froude makes the following remarks upon this latter “recantation :”—“The demands of the Church of Rome might have been satisfied by these last admissions ; but Cranmer had not yet expiated his personal offences against the Queen and her mother, and he was to drain the cup of humiliation to the dregs.” In the sixth renunciation Cranmer styled himself—

A blasphemer, and a persecutor ; that being unable to undo his evil work, he had no hope, he said, save in the example of the thief upon the cross, who, when other means of reparation were taken away from him, made amends to God with his lips. He was unworthy of mercy, and he deserved eternal vengeance. He had sinned against King Henry and his wife (Katherine), *he was the cause of the divorce from which, as from a seed, had sprung up schism, heresy, and crime* ; he had opened a window to false doctrines, of which he had been himself the most pernicious teacher ; especially he reflected with anguish that *he had denied the presence of his Maker in the consecrated elements*. He had deceived the living, and he had wronged the souls of the dead by stealing from them their Masses ; he prayed the Pope to pardon him ; he prayed the King and Queen (Philip and Mary) to pardon him ; he prayed God Almighty to pardon him as He had pardoned Mary Magdalene, or to look upon him as from His own cross He had looked upon the thief<sup>7</sup>.

It is stated that the above recantation was drawn up by Cardinal Pole, that Cranmer was induced to sign it ; that “fresh tortures were presented to him by Pole’s

<sup>7</sup> “ Recantation of Thomas Cranmer,” Jenkins, vol. iv. p. 393.

messengers, and the wearied, timid martyr fell into the trap laid for him by Pole and Bonner.” Strype is also of opinion that this recantation is in part the composition of Pole. Whatever schemes Edmund Bonner might concoct, Reginald Pole was incapable of participating in them. The statement is made merely on conjecture. The latest researches prove that the recantation was solely the composition of Archbishop Cranmer himself. Had any other than himself drawn up the document, is it not most natural that he would have eagerly denounced it? Yet, in his last speech, he made no reference to such an alleged concoction.

Dean Hook, after discussing the probabilities of Cranmer’s motives at this crisis, and the traps supposed to have been laid to catch him, observes that “a degradation more pitiable it was impossible to imagine. The triumph over him was complete.”

On Saturday, the 21st of March, 1556, Archbishop Cranmer was led to the stake, and the scene, as Bishop Gardiner’s chaplain has described it, was “one of the saddest and most disgraceful spectacles that Christian men could behold.” Cranmer made a “long discourse,” in which he spoke against the “love of the world, rebellion against the Queen, his feelings on the edge of eternity;” he also gave a wholesome advice to the spectators. Being then called upon to make a public declaration of his recent recantations, he addressed the people amidst a breathless silence:—

And now, good people, I come to the great thing that troubleth my conscience more than any other thing that I ever said or did in my life, and that is the setting abroad of writings contrary to the truth,

---

<sup>8</sup> “Archbishops of Canterbury,” vol. vii. p. 404.

which here I now renounce and refuse as things *written with my hand* contrary to the truth which I thought in my heart, and written for fear of death, to save my life, if it might be ; and that is all such bills and papers as I have written and signed with my hand since my degradation, wherein I have written many things untrue, and for as much as *my hand offended in writing contrary to my heart, my hand therefore shall first be punished, for as I come to the fire it shall be the first burnt.* As for the Pope, I utterly refuse him, as Christ's enemy and Anti-Christ, with all his false doctrines ; and as for the Sacrament (Eucharist), I believe as I have taught in my book against the Bishop of Winchester<sup>9</sup>.

The proceedings connected with the trial and condemnation of Cranmer were conducted with all the indifference to humanity, fair play, and equity characteristic of what at that period was designated "law." The Archbishop was denied counsel ; the long silver hair which imparted so venerable an aspect to his appearance was shorn closely ; he was clothed as a malefactor in prison vesture, and stood derided and insulted, yet fearless, before his accusers. Though he himself had often tried men after the same fashion, it was not the less wicked that he shold be compelled to taste of the bitterness of injustice ; equity and humanity not the less condemn the process, whatever might have been the antecedents of the victim. Cranmer's political offences were quite sufficient to seal his doom in that age, in fact almost in any age. His malfeasance against the Church should have been left for the adjudication of the Supreme Court above. Churchmen should not seek vengeance after the fashion of the world ; but in the spirit of our Saviour pronounce the decree of Divine charity, "*Go thy ways, and sin no more.*" They would, then, even in the eyes of the unnumbered myriads who

<sup>9</sup> Harleian MSS. ; Jenkins, Strype, Hook.

shared their belief, have given a judgment more fatal to the new tenets of Thomas Cranmer than the immolation at the stake of ten thousand “obstinate thinkers.”

Upon the closing scene Mr. Froude writes thus strikingly :—

“ He was brought out, with the eyes of his soul blinded, to make sport for his enemies, and in his death he brought upon them a wider destruction than he had effected by his teaching when alive. The Court had overreached themselves by their cruelty<sup>1</sup>. Had they been contented to accept the recantation, they would have left the Archbishop to die broken-hearted, pointed at by the finger of pitying scorn, and the Reformation would have been disgraced in its champion. They were tempted by an evil spirit of revenge into an act unsanctioned even by their own bloody laws ; and they gave him an opportunity of redeeming his fame and writing his name in the roll of martyrs.”

—“ Fronde’s History of England,” vol. vi. pp. 429, 430.

In the final act of these proceedings the Queen should not have consented to the cruel judgment against heretics, as she might justly have consigned Cranmer to the headsman as a rebel. This would have deprived him of even the poor distinction now attaching to his name, and left him no merit but the Spartan stoicism of his end. The barbarous death he suffered, and the cause for which he was mistakenly condemned, have procured for him the title of a “ Protestant Martyr,”—Martyr for a creed which he foreswore but the preceding hour, and which he resumed in fury when he found himself deceived in the alleged pardon promised for his recantation !

<sup>1</sup> According to a statute of Henry the Eighth, those who “relapsed into heresy were to be consumed at the stake *in terrorem.*” Archbishop Cranmer was a party to the passing of this cruel law; and as it was one of his royal master’s favourite subjects, it is not improbable that the Archbishop drew up the Act himself, aided by Maister Rich, thus perishing, in “legal” shape at least, by the work of his own hands. The execution really took place under this Act.

No man of his era clothed soul and conscience in so many disguises—none embraced more opposite principles. His demeanour at the stake has won him fame for his wondrous disregard of suffering ; but those who know him, and the facts, look upon his conduct in the hour of dissolution as that of a man maddened and desperate from disappointed hope. Indeed it has been well remarked, and that, too, by a friendly biographer, that the “flames which consumed Thomas Cranmer’s body at the stake have cast a false glitter upon his character.”

Much ingenuity has been manifested by certain writers either in denying the crimes of Cranmer, or in excusing them when impossible of denial. The most feeble of all apologies, however, is that which ascribes his actions to weak-mindedness or timidity. On the contrary, his suppleness of conduct was the result of a self-contained and measured prevision. Dean Hook, remarking upon Cranmer’s bearing under sentence of death, states that the letters he wrote to the Queen manifested “no want of boldness”—nor gave the “ slightest indication of a wavering mind<sup>2</sup>.” Let the reader reflect on the part he played, and then draw his own deductions. First, Cranmer was for seventeen years the confidential adviser of Henry ; the secret negotiator with the German theologians on the divorce question. At the command of the King he pronounced the marriages of three queens to be null and void, and was a party to the judicial murder of two of them. He was an adviser of Henry when the Carthusians were immolated ; when

<sup>2</sup> “Archbishops of Canterbury,” vol. vii. p. 376.

Fisher and More were sent to the scaffold; when the Marquis of Exeter and his friends were consigned to the headsman; when the Abbots of Glastonbury, Reading, and Woburn were plundered, hanged, and quartered; when the Pilgrims of Grace were first deceived and then massacred; when the trees were bent with the corpses of the northern peasantry; when Lord Darcy and his chivalrous companions perished on the scaffold; when Lady Bulmer was sent to the flames, and the venerable Countess of Salisbury, one of the noblest of the Plantagenets, butchered; when his co-partner in the monastic confiscation paid the penalty of an ignominious death; when those who held his own opinions were sent to the stake as heretics; when the Six Acts became law; when the rack, the dungeon, the rope, and the axe spread desolation throughout the land; when confiscation or banishment became the lot of those who were the least offensive to the royal will;—still Thomas Cranmer, through all these weary years of violence, blood, and despotism, enjoyed the tyrant's confidence—nay, even unto the last dread death-scene. And again, having perjured himself as to his dead master's will, for seven years longer he gave all the weight of his position and talents to promote the schemes of the Duke of Somerset and his colleagues, and then of Northumberland, in perfidy, confiscation, legal murders, concocted massacres, and treason; and every conspiracy that was planned by the members of Edward's Council for the destruction of each other received the Archbishop's support—just as soon as he had made himself certain as to which was the strongest side. The prelate who could have maintained his political position, his liberty, or his life—as the colleague

of such men—must, indeed, have been the reverse of “weak.” On the contrary, he must have been a thorough “man of the world,” in its worst sense, possessed, it would seem, not only of a remorseless versatility, but a signal power of moulding men and events to his own purposes. Such was Thomas Cranmer, “some time” Archbishop of Canterbury.

As an illustration of the want of principle in parties in the reign of Mary, it may be observed that at the execution of Northumberland and Sir John Gates several “noblemen and gentlemen of rank,” who had once identified themselves with the principles of the condemned, were present, and demeaned themselves with a levity of manner that brought as much suspicion upon their present politics as its heartlessness impressed disgrace upon their manhood. They overwrought their part, and instead of convincing their new allies, they simply succeeded in becoming detestable for duplicity and cowardice. Again, in the case of Archbishop Cranmer, the “noble and gentle” vultures scented the sacrifice from afar, and repaired to Oxford from all parts of the kingdom, to behold, to countenance, and applaud the lamentable spectacle of an English prelate tied to a stake to suffer the most terrible of deaths. A very few years before those same “exalted spectators” presided at the burnings, hangings and disembowellings of priests and monks, as well as at the death-scenes of the noblest of the laity. They were *then* Reformers of the genuine “God-fearing” stamp—disciples of the new light, the *alumni* of Cromwell and Cranmer. *Presto!* principles and sentiments are changed, from the lowest depths, by the motion of a new sceptre, and the Reformer of yesterday is the Roman of to-day, a veri-

table child of the olden Church—at least until the accession of Elizabeth. Truly those were not the days described by the poet-philosopher, when “Heaven smiled upon conscience.”

---

## NOTE.

It is a pleasing duty to express my sincere and respectful acknowledgments to those clergymen of the Established Church who, in the course of this work, afforded me opportunities of consulting rare black-letter tomes, MS. documents, diaries, &c., in their possession. I find, by reference to an influential daily journal of October 21, 1871, that “Canon Kingsley told the people of Bristol the other day that the chief want of England was a love of fact, that decline was the fate of every nation which lost the habit of speaking or acting the truth, and that he himself had given up the chair of Modern History at Cambridge because history was so overlaid with lies as to make it impossible for him to get any truth out of her statements.” In such a condition of our country’s history any one who brings a stone to the Temple of Truth is not without some desert; and I cheerfully assign their full share of merit to those who have in any way assisted me. To the officials of the literary department of the British Museum I would be more diffuse in my thanks, as they one and all deserve, did not long experience prove that courtesy, kindly attention, and delicate consideration seem to be such unavoidable attributes of the gentlemen who officiate in that important department of an unrivalled institution as to render all expression of gratitude unnecessary. My only regret is, that the exigency of space has compelled me, in this second volume, to compress a host of interesting particulars.

S. H. BURKE.

END OF VOL. II.

6







